



BIBLIOTHECA  
FF. PRÆDICATORUM,  
BENITIÆ.

No.

7

**DEAR READER,**

**DUE TO THE FRAGILITY AND/OR  
BRITTLINESS OF THIS BOOK,  
IT MUST BY USED IN THE LIBRARY  
AND CANNOT BE PHOTOCOPIED.**

**PLEASE BE GENTLE WITH IT.**

**THANK YOU.**







A  
CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL  
REVIEW  
OF  
FOX'S BOOK OF MARTYRS,  
SHEWING THE  
INACCURACIES, FALSEHOODS, AND MISREPRESENTATIONS  
IN THAT  
WORK OF DECEPTION.

BY  
William Eusebins Andrews.

VOLUME II.

LONDON:  
PUBLISHED BY M. ANDREWS,

DUKE STREET, LITTLE BRITAIN.

1853.

Property of  
**COSA**

Please return to

Graduate Theological  
Union Library

BR

1600

F792

A752

1853

V. 2

# CONTENTS.

---

	Page.
Abbeys privileged . . . . .	247
Acts of Persecutions in Scotland . . . . .	392
Alfred the Great, his Laws . . . . .	38
Altars turned to Tables . . . . .	482
Amusements abolished . . . . .	437
Assassination Plot . . . . .	650
Augustin, St., comes to England . . . . .	5
Barlow, William, character of, . . . . .	574
Beaton, Cardinal, murder of, . . . . .	356
Bible, Wickliffe's Translation of the, . . . . .	64
Bird, John, character of, . . . . .	574
Bishops displaced by Mary . . . . .	573
Boleyn, Anne . . . . .	134, 169, 193
Execution of, . . . . .	218
Bonner, Bishop, . . . . .	587
Boulogne lost . . . . .	470
Burnet's character of Reformers . . . . .	422
Bush, Paul, character of, . . . . .	574
Buchanan, George, character of, . . . . .	382
Catholicism introduced into England . . . . .	5
Catholic Religion, efficacy of, . . . . .	10
Re-established . . . . .	577
Catharine, Queen, marriage of, . . . . .	131
Trial of, . . . . .	144
Speech of, . . . . .	ib.
Celibacy of Clergy . . . . .	17
Christian Saxons, character of, . . . . .	9
Churches stripped . . . . .	438
Cleves, Anne of, . . . . .	309
Cobham, Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester . . . . .	91
Constance, Council of, . . . . .	111
Collier on the Monasteries . . . . .	256
Convocation, debates of the, . . . . .	270
Conscience, liberty of, granted by Mary . . . . .	545
Confirmation defended by the Fathers . . . . .	452
Conversion of England . . . . .	1
Courtney conspires against Mary . . . . .	559

	Page.
Covenant, Scotch, . . . . .	392
Cranmer . . . . . 156, 192, 198, 217, 309,	329
Holds the Doctrine of Divine Right . . . . .	408
Ecclesiastical code . . . . .	457
Cromwell, account of, . . . . .	226, 265, 309
Cross, sign of the, defended by the Fathers . . . . .	446
Darnley, Henry, blown up . . . . .	388
Dissolution of Religious Establishments . . . . .	432
Divisions among the Reformers . . . . .	479
Divorce, observations on, . . . . .	152
Doctrines disputed . . . . .	278
Dugdale's account of the destruction of the Monasteries . . . . .	234
Edward VI., proceedings of, . . . . .	397
Prayer of, . . . . .	504
Elizabeth, Queen, a persecutor of conscience . . . . .	549
Conspires against Mary . . . . .	571
England, deplorable state of, . . . . .	486
Extreme Unction defended by the Fathers . . . . .	454
Excommunication . . . . .	483
Fasting enacted by Parliament . . . . .	449
Farrar, Robert, character of, . . . . .	574
Fire of London . . . . .	629
Fisher, Bishop, . . . . .	206
Speech of, in Convocation . . . . .	272
Forgery peculiar to the Reformation . . . . .	390
Foreign troops introduced . . . . .	442
Gardiner, Bishop, . . . . .	559, 587
Gates, Sir John, speech of, at execution . . . . .	537
Gregory the Great meditates the conversion of England . . . . .	4
Gregory VII. and Henry VI. . . . .	27
Grey, Lady Jane, proclaimed Queen . . . . .	530
Gunpowder Plot . . . . .	623
Hæretico comburendo . . . . .	591
Heretics burnt by Cranmer . . . . .	473
Henry VIII., scruples of, . . . . .	133
Speech of, . . . . .	140
Marries Anne Boleyn . . . . .	169
Character of, . . . . .	334
Funeral of, . . . . .	407
Holgate, character of, . . . . .	573
Iconoclasts, the, . . . . .	401
Insurrections of the people . . . . .	464

# CONTENTS.

v

	Page.
Ingelburga and Philip of France . . . . .	152
Innovations, supposed, in religion . . . . .	24
Irish Massacre . . . . .	632
John, king of England, surrenders his crown . . . . .	35
Kett's insurrection in Norfolk . . . . .	466
Knox, John, character of, . . . . .	381
Langton, Cardinal, . . . . .	44
Libraries destroyed . . . . .	249
Lingard on Catharine's marriage . . . . .	163
Liturgy, Reformed, set forth . . . . .	439
Lollards, persecution of the, . . . . .	119
Luther, progress of the doctrine of, . . . . .	122
Martyrdoms, pretended, . . . . .	316
Marriage of clergy legalized . . . . .	431
Mary, Queen, accession of, . . . . .	518
Crowned . . . . .	542
Described by Burnet . . . . .	521
Vindicated . . . . .	527
Marriage of, . . . . .	558, 576
Terms of treaty of marriage . . . . .	560
Entry into London . . . . .	542
Character of, . . . . .	617
Resigns the Church property . . . . .	604
Described by Mr. Brewer . . . . .	606
Mary, Queen of Scots, treatment of, . . . . .	388
Monasteries, destruction of, . . . . .	115, 227
More, Sir Thomas, . . . . .	188, 210
Murray, Earl, character of, . . . . .	384
Northumberland, duke of, sent against Mary . . . . .	531
Arrested and beheaded . . . . .	536
Oldcastle, Sir John, confession of, . . . . .	101
Outrages of the Reformers . . . . .	572
Pagan Saxons, character of, . . . . .	8
Parr, Catharine, marriage of, . . . . .	330
People, discontent of the, . . . . .	462
Persecution not a part of Catholicism . . . . .	74
Origin of, in Mary's reign . . . . .	587
At Nismes . . . . .	653
Pole, Cardinal, against persecution . . . . .	595
Pope, ascendancy of the, . . . . .	11
Popish Plot . . . . .	629
Powder Plot in Scotland . . . . .	388

	Page.
Protestant martyrs, modern, . . . . .	630
Purgatory, the Fathers on the doctrine of, . . . . .	412
Rapacity of courtiers . . . . .	485
Rebellion in Norfolk, &c., against Mary . . . . .	599
Reformation, the, . . . . .	113
Progress of, in Scotland . . . . .	363
In England, in the reign of Edward VI. . . . .	397
In Ireland . . . . .	508
Horrible Sacrileges during the, . . . . .	512
Reformers, deposing power assumed by the, . . . . .	371
Rebellions of the, . . . . .	369
Faith of Scotch, . . . . .	372
Sacrilege of, . . . . .	375
Persecuting spirit of, . . . . .	377
Revenues and number of monasteries . . . . .	258
Ridley's discourse with Mary . . . . .	532
Dr., speech of, on the Divorce . . . . .	149
Schism in the Church . . . . .	108
Scotland, persecutions in, . . . . .	343, 392
Seditious writings . . . . .	585
Six Articles . . . . .	297
Slavery legalized . . . . .	429
Somerset, Lord High Admiral, beheaded . . . . .	489
Lord Protector, beheaded . . . . .	499
Somerset-house built . . . . .	490
Spirit in the Wall . . . . .	576
Supremacy of the Pope . . . . .	171
The Fathers on, . . . . .	177
Speech against the king's, . . . . .	186
Sufferers for denying the king's, . . . . .	190
Authorities on, . . . . .	581
Taxation, curious scale of, . . . . .	58
Tindal's Bible . . . . .	284
Transubstantiation professed by the Reformers . . . . .	440
Tyler, Wat, insurrection of . . . . .	59
Universities on Henry's Marriage . . . . .	157
Visitation of Churches . . . . .	417
Wickliffe, John, doctrines of . . . . .	52, 69
Wolsey, Cardinal . . . . .	115
Wyatt's rebellion . . . . .	562
Taken and executed . . . . .	570



EXECUTIONS OF—	Page.
Acton, Roger . . . . .	88
Askew, Anne . . . . .	329
Badby, Thomas . . . . .	80
Barnes, Dr. . . . .	317
Bocher, Joan . . . . .	473
Claydon, William . . . . .	86
Cobham, Eleanor . . . . .	91
Cranmer . . . . .	602
Damlip, Adam . . . . .	327
Dudley, Guilford . . . . .	568
Filmer . . . . .	325
Fisher, Bishop . . . . .	208
Forrett, Dean . . . . .	352
Forest, Henry . . . . .	319
Frith . . . . .	220
Garrett, Thomas . . . . .	317
Gourlay, Norman . . . . .	350
Grey, Lady Jane . . . . .	569
Hamilton, Patrick . . . . .	348
Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester . . . . .	597
Hun, Richard . . . . .	116
Jerome, William . . . . .	317
Kennedy . . . . .	354
Lambert . . . . .	299
Latimer . . . . .	600
Manderville . . . . .	90
Marbeck . . . . .	319
More, Sir Thomas . . . . .	210
Murto . . . . .	87
Oldcastle, Sir John . . . . .	93
Pearson, Anthony . . . . .	325
Ridley . . . . .	600
Rogers, Prebendary . . . . .	597
Russel, Richard . . . . .	99
Russel . . . . .	354
Sawtre . . . . .	76
Stratton, David . . . . .	350
Suffolk, Duke of . . . . .	570
Testwood . . . . .	325
Van Parre, George . . . . .	474
Wishart . . . . .	355



## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

---

WE are now arrived at a very interesting period of our Review, inasmuch as it relates to the history of our own country, about which so much has been written to no purpose, a great deal to delude and keep the people in ignorance, and but a small portion to instruct and inform the searcher after truth. As we, at the commencement of the first volume of this work, shewed *how* the Christian or Catholic religion was first established and propagated by the apostles of Christ in the east, and *how* it was *preserved* when it had spread to other parts of the globe, so we purpose here, by way of preface to this volume, to shew *how* this *same* system of Christianity was *introduced* and *preserved* in England, till the era of what is called the Reformation. Fox begins his eighth book, or the “few plain Christian” editors for him, in *their* edition, with “*a brief history of the Reformation, and the remarkable circumstances which preceded it, from the time of Wickliffe to the reign of queen Mary,*” so that the reader is left in total darkness concerning the events which occurred *previous* to the heresy of Wickliffe. It is true, we have some “particulars relative to the great ascendancy of the popes throughout Christendom, in the *middle* ages,” but these particulars are given, as usual, in so confused and unauthorized a manner, that it requires considerable ingenuity to unravel them, and no little space to refute them with that accuracy which is essential to carry conviction to the prejudiced reader of our pages.

The precise period when Christianity was first announced in Britain is not accurately known; some contend that St. Peter brought the glad tidings of “peace on earth to men of good will,” while others give the honour to Joseph of

Arimathea. This much however is certain, and is admitted by both Fox and his modern editors, that king Lucius, a British prince, sent to pope Eleutherius to solicit the aid of Christian missionaries, and that the holy pope sent to him two zealous prelates, St. Fugatius and Damianus, by whom he was instructed in the Catholic faith, and who preached to and converted many of his people. This event happened about the year 182, and we refer the reader to page 86 of the first volume, where he will see an account of it taken from authentic writers. Lucius, on receiving the light of Christianity, immediately began to provide for its support and duration, by the erection of churches, and appointing revenues for the maintenance of the priesthood. Gildas, Nennius, and Bede, say that he founded churches in each of the cities in his dominions. It may here be remarked, that our island, though governed by native sovereigns, was tributary to the Roman empire, and with Lucius ended the dynasty of British princes. The emperors, on his death, governed the island by their own officers, having reduced it into four provinces; but in the course of time, the most powerful of these governors assumed the title of emperor. The first of these, we are informed, was Clodius Albinus, who proclaimed himself emperor in 193. This state of things continued during a century, and as a proof that Christianity still existed in the island, we have the testimony of Fox and his editors, who have recorded the martyrdom of St. Alban, who suffered in the persecution of Dioclesian, and was a Catholic martyr, as we have proved in our first volume.

This persecution did not last above two years in Britain, but the Christians did not dare to hold their religious assemblies or raise temples to the worship of God, until they were authorized so to do by the edict of Constantine the Great, in 312. On the appearance of this decree, the British Catholics began to vie with each other in the beauty and magnificence of the churches they raised, which they accomplished by voluntary contributions, there being no British sovereign to assist them in the pious work. That

these Christians were Catholics, and acknowledged the supremacy of the pope, is clear from their prelates joining in the general councils and synods on all public occasions. Some of them were present at the first council of Arles, in 313, when the wrong celebration of Easter was condemned; and at the general council of Sardica, in 347, in which the liberty of appeals to the bishop of Rome was confirmed. On the decay of the Roman power, the western provinces of that vast empire experienced various revolutions, but none was so complete as that of our island. Several of the provinces fell under the sway of different rulers, until a sense of danger induced the people to choose a chief magistrate or king, in order to resist the daring attempts of barbarous invaders, who were incessantly making inroads on the island. The choice fell on Vortigern, and a more unlucky selection could not have been made. He was slothful and sensual, and when threatened with invasion by the Picts or Caledonians, he had the baseness to propose, and the address to persuade the council of the Britons to accept, with open arms, the assistance of a foreign nation, to repel their warlike neighbours. Accordingly, in the year 449, the Saxon leaders, Hengist and Horsa, two brothers, with a formidable body of that nation, landed in the isle of Thanet, and soon after they gave signal proofs of their valour by defeating and totally routing the army of the Picts and Scots in the vicinity of Stamford, in Lincolnshire. By the fresh arrival of Saxons, Hengist found himself strong, and throwing off the yoke of obedience, he founded the first kingdom of Kent, in the year 457. For upwards of a century continual struggles were entered into between the native British and the Saxon invaders, which ended in the erection of six more Saxon kingdoms, the last of which, Mercia, was founded in 585, by which extraordinary revolution one race of men was totally rooted out, and another planted on the same soil. With the extirpation of the British race religion also fell, a signal punishment of a degenerate and sinful nation, and Pagan idolatry was again established in the island of Great Britain.

The darkness of Paganism, however, had scarcely covered the island, when a ray of light beamed in the horizon, which shortly extended its rays over the whole country. We have before noticed the conversion of the ancient Britons by two holy prelates, sent from Rome by pope Eleutherius; it is now our duty to shew the reader *how* our Saxon ancestors became acquainted with the blessings of Christianity. The first mover of this work of piety and charity was St. Gregory the Great, who filled the chair of St. Peter, that is, was bishop of Rome, and head of the Catholic church, from the year 590 to 604. Previous to his elevation to the papal throne, Gregory had raised himself in public estimation by his great prudence, sanctity, and writings. Walking one day through the market-place of Rome, Gregory noticed several youths of fine features and complexion that were exposed for sale, and enquired what country they came from. He was answered that they came from Britain. He then asked if they were Christians or heathens; and was told the latter. On this he fetched a deep sigh, and lamented that so fine an outside should have so little of the grace of God within. Bede relates, that on being answered that the natives of Britain were called Angli or Angles, Gregory replied, "Right, for they have angelical faces, and it becomes such to be companions with the angels in heaven. What is the name (he continued) of the province from which they are brought?" It was replied, that it was called Deiri; "Truly, Deiri," said he, "because mercy withdrawn from wrath, and called to the mercy of Christ," alluding to the Latin, *De ira Dei eruti*. He asked further, "How is the king of that province called?" He was told his name was Alle; on which Gregory, in allusion to the word, said, "Alleluia, the praise of God the Creator, must be sung in those parts."

Fired with these holy ideas, Gregory applied to pope Benedict I. to have some persons sent to preach Christianity in Britian. Not finding any one disposed to undertake the mission, he solicited the pope's consent, and obtained his approbation to apply his own labours in the conversion of the



island. Accordingly he set forward with some of his fellow monks on the journey, but he was stopped by the people, who complained to the holy father, and requested him not to suffer Gregory to depart from Rome. On this pressing occasion, Gregory was ordered to return, which he did with great reluctance, and after some time had elapsed, in which he distinguished himself by his great qualities, Gregory was called to the papal chair himself, by the unanimous voice of the clergy, the senate, and the people. Placed in the apostolical chair, the holy pope did not forget the impression made upon him in favour of Britain, and he selected St. Augustin, then prior to the monastery to which Gregory belonged, to be superior of the mission, in which he was assisted by several of the monks. Having received their commission, the missionaries set out with zeal and joy; and on their way through France, an attempt was made to turn their intention aside, by representing the English people as ferocious and cruel, but no obstacles could deter these holy men from their purpose. Taking some Frenchmen along with them for interpreters, they landed in the isle of Thanet, in the year 597, being in all about forty persons.

It is not a little singular, that this isle was the spot on which the Saxon hordes first placed their feet, by whom Christianity was rooted out of the island; and now, about 150 years after, the ambassadors of Christ appeared, to regain the people from the power of Satan, and bend them to a yoke that is both sweet and light. From this place Augustin sent a message to Ethelbert, king of Kent, announcing his mission, and assuring him of the divine promise of a kingdom that never was to end. Ethelbert was not a stranger to the Christian faith, as his queen was a daughter of Caribert, king of Paris, and had with her a bishop for her director and almoner. After some days, the king went in person to the isle, and ordered Augustin to his presence in the open air. The religious men came to him in procession, with joy and devotion, carrying for their banner a silver cross, and an image of our Saviour painted on a board, singing as they

walked, the litany, and praying for the souls they came to save. Being admitted into the presence of the king, who was seated under a tree, they announced to him the word of life. The king listened with attention, seemed pleased with the interesting truths he heard, and promised to take them into his serious consideration. It may not be unworthy of remark here, that these proclaimers of God's truths did not go forth with a large stock of bibles, which in those days were useless, as but few could read, but they were armed with the Spirit of Truth, and they carried with them the *image* of the crucified GOD they came to announce, which is the practice of the Catholic missionaries at this day; and for which they are reprobated by the advocates for bible reading. That the bible never was intended by God, or by the writers of it, for indiscriminate reading is most certain, from the fact, that no nation whatever has been converted through the means of the bible, though many have been perverted from the truth by having recourse to their own fanciful theories, instead of guiding their reason by the unerring rule of truth. It was by *preaching* the word which God commanded them to announce to all nations, that the world was Catholicized, and the adherents of the bible-system may be assured, that all their efforts to un-Catholicize them, by forcing the bible, will prove futile. The king was pleased with the holy lives of these missionaries, so much is example above precept in captivating the human mind; he gave them permission to preach to the people, and he even received the waters of regeneration himself. On receiving the grace of baptism, Ethelbert became a new man; he permitted the holy missionaries to build and repair churches every where, and he afforded them every assistance in this pious work his kingly prerogative allowed him. Having thus far succeeded, St. Augustin went to Arles, where he was consecrated bishop, and on his return to Britain he dispatched two of his fellow labourers to Rome, to solicit a further supply of workmen to cultivate the vineyard he had thus planted. The good pope Gregory sent him over several of his own disciples, among

whom was Mellitus, the first bishop of Rochester ; Paulinus, the first archbishop of York ; and Rufemanus, the third abbot of Augustin's. "With this colony of new missionaries," writes our countryman, venerable Bede, "the holy pope sent all things in general for the divine worship and the service of the church, viz., sacred vessels, altar-cloths, ornaments for churches, and vestments for priests and clerks ; relics of the holy apostles and martyrs, and many books."

We have thus shewn, *how* the Christian religion was introduced amongst our Saxon ancestors ; it now remains to prove *what* that system of religion was. This is a point which Fox and his modern editors gloss over, though it is the most essential of any, to come at the knowledge of truth. Gildas and Bede testify, that the faith which was planted by St. Augustin was the same that was held at Rome, and that our ancestors, like the primitive Christians, were ever watchful to preserve it pure and untainted. Thus, when Arianism shot its baneful sprouts, it was immediately detected and extirpated. Pelagianism had no sooner infected the church, than recourse was had to the proper authorities, who checked the growing evil, and eventually eradicated it. Now this faith, thus carefully preserved, is the same as that preached by the apostles of Christ, and followed by the Catholics of this day. The Saxons on embracing Christianity admitted infant baptism, for which there is no warranty of scripture, and therefore must be followed from tradition. They believed in *seven* sacraments, though the church of England now admits of only two. They held confession, absolution, transubstantiation, purgatory, the invocation of saints and angels, prayers for the dead, the mass, celibacy, and, in short, every article of faith, and discipline of the church, rejected at the so much vaunted event, called the *Reformation*. Let the reader now refer back to the beginning of our first volume, and it will there be seen, that all these points of doctrine were held and taught by the fathers of the Catholic church in every age, from the apostles to the period of the conversion of our island by St. Augustin ; and we shall shew in the

course of this volume, that they were maintained with undeviating accuracy, till Luther began his work of infamy and delusion. Since which they have remained, unaltered, the creed of Catholics, and will remain to the end of time, a testimony of the promise of Christ, that his words should not fail.

The "few plain Christians" have represented the Catholic religion, or Popery, as they call it, as inseparable from persecution—a blood-thirsty system of cruelty and intolerance; it will not be, therefore, irrelevant to our purpose if we lay before the reader a short outline of the character of our Saxon ancestors when under the influence of Paganism, and the change which took place in their manners after they submitted to the benign precepts of the Catholic faith. This outline we will not trust to our own pen, but give it in the words of an elegant and classical writer of the present day, who has made the ancient history of this country his peculiar study. The Rev. Dr. Lingard, in his *Antiquities of the Saxon Church*, writes thus:—"By the ancient writers, the Saxons are unanimously classed with the most barbarous of the nations which invaded and dismembered the Roman empire. Their valour was disgraced by their brutality. To the services they generally preferred the blood of their captives; and the man, whose life they condescended to spare, was taught to consider perpetual servitude as a gratuitous favour. Among themselves, a rude and imperfect system of legislation intrusted to private revenge the punishment of private injuries; and the ferocity of their passions continually multiplied these deadly and hereditary feuds. Avarice and the lust of sensual enjoyment had extinguished in their breasts some of the first feelings of nature. The savages of Africa may traffic with Europeans for the negroes whom they have seized by treachery, or captured in open war; but the more savage conquerors of the Britons sold with scruple to the merchants of the continent their countrymen, and even their own children. Their religion was accommodated to their manners, and their manners were perpetuated by their reli-

gion. In their theology they acknowledged no sin but cowardice; and revered no virtue but courage. Their gods they appeased with the blood of human victims. Of a future life their notions were faint and wavering; and if the soul were fated to survive the body, to quaff ale out of the skulls of their enemies, was to be the great reward of the virtuous; to lead a life of hunger and inactivity, the endless punishment of the wicked.

“Such were the Pagan Saxons. But their ferocity soon yielded to the exertions of the missionaries, and the harsher features of their origin were insensibly softened under the mild influence of the gospel. In the rage of victory they learned to respect the rights of humanity. Death or slavery was no longer the fate of the conquered Britons; by their submission they were incorporated with the victors: and their lives and property were protected by the equity of their Christian conquerors. The acquisition of religious knowledge introduced a new spirit of legislation; the presence of the bishops and superior clergy improved the wisdom of the national councils; and laws were framed to punish the more flagrant violations of morality, and prevent the daily broils which harassed the peace of society. The humane idea, that by baptism all men become brethren, contributed to meliorate the condition of slavery, and scattered the seeds of that liberty, which gradually undermined, and at length abolished so odious an institution. By the provision of the legislature the freedom of the child was secured from the avarice of an unnatural parent; and the heaviest punishment was denounced against the man who presumed to sell to a foreign master one of his countrymen, though he were a slave or a malefactor. But by nothing were the converts more distinguished than by their piety. The conviction of a future and endless existence beyond the grave elevated their minds, and expanded their ideas. To prepare their souls for this new state of being, was to many the first object of their solicitude: they eagerly sought every source of instruction, and with scrupulous fidelity practised every duty which they had



learnt. Of the zeal of the more opulent among the laity, the numerous churches, hospitals, and monasteries which they founded, are a sufficient proof: and the clergy could boast with equal truth, of the piety displayed by the more eminent of their order, and of the nations instructed in the Christian faith, by the labours of St. Boniface, and his associates. In the clerical and monastic establishments, the most sublime of the gospel virtues were carefully practised; even kings descended from their thrones, and exchanged the sceptre for the cowl. Their conduct was applauded by their contemporaries; and the moderns, whose supercilious wisdom affects to censure it, must at least esteem the motives which inspired, and admire the resolution which completed the sacrifice. The progress of civilization kept equal pace with the progress of religion; not only the useful but the agreeable arts were introduced; every species of knowledge which could be attained was eagerly studied; and during the gloom of ignorance, which overspread the rest of Europe, learning found, for a certain period an asylum among the Saxons of Britain. To this picture an ingenious adversary may indeed oppose a very different description. He may collect the vices which have been stigmatized by the zeal of their preachers, and point to the crimes which disgraced the characters of some of their monarchs. But the impartial observer will acknowledge the impossibility of eradicating at once, the fiercer passions of a whole nation; nor be surprised, if he behold several of them relapse into their former manners, and on some occasions unite the actions of savages with the profession of Christians. To judge of the advantage which the Saxons derived from their conversion, he will fix his eyes on their virtues. *They* were the offsprings of the gospel; their vices were the relics of paganism."

To give an instance of the power and efficacy of the Catholic religion to reclaim sinners from their evil ways to the paths of rectitude and virtue, of whatsoever rank and condition they may be, we will here quote a fact related by the above learned author, in his valuable *History of England*.—"Ethelbert



(writes the historian) died in 616. The crown devolved upon his son Eadbald, the violence of whose passions had nearly replunged the nation into that idolatry from which it had just emerged. The youth and beauty of his stepmother, the relict of Ethelbert, induced him to take her to his bed ; and when the missionaries admonished him to break the unnatural connexion, he abandoned a religion which forbade the gratification of his appetites. At the same time, the three sons of Saberet (their father was dead) restored the altars of the gods, and banished from their territory the bishop Mellitus. With Justus of Rochester he retired into Gaul : and Laurentius, the successor of Augustin in the see of Canterbury, had determined to follow their footsteps. On the morning of his intended departure, he made a last attempt on the mind of Eadbald. His representations were successful. The king dismissed his stepmother and recalled the fugitive prelates. The sincerity of his conversion was proved by his subsequent conduct ; and Christianity, supported by his influence, assumed an ascendancy which it ever afterwards preserved." Here then, we have a striking effect of the influence of religion on the mind, when supported by the voice of spotless ministers. How different was the conduct of this Christian and Catholic bishop to that of a modern prelate of London, who, on a memorable occasion, asserted in his place in parliament that a king of England could do no wrong.

The Catholic religion being thus established in our island, a regular hierarchy was founded for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs, and the preservation of true doctrine. Thus, when any dispute occurred, or any grievance was complained of, recourse was had to the regular authority : from the suffragan bishop the matter was carried to the metropolitan either of Canterbury or York, who, if need required, summoned a provincial synod to discuss the point, and the decision was submitted to the pope, as the supreme head of the universal church. By these means the Catholic religion was preserved entire for the space of nine hundred years, until Henry the Eighth severed the branch from the parent stock,

and made himself head of a separate church, which had no other claim to jurisdiction than what the lay power of the state granted to it. During the period of Catholicism, the spiritual authority of the church was quite distinct from the authority of the state. The king and nobles were obliged to submit to the same discipline as the peasant and the beggar, because the church being a kingdom of another world, knows no distinction in her system of morality, between the monarch and the vassal. With these remarks, we shall proceed in our Review of the work before us.

## "BOOK VIII.

"CONTAINING A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, AND THE REMARKABLE CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH PRECEDED IT, FROM THE TIME OF WICKLIFFE TO THE REIGN OF QUEEN MARY.

## "SECTION I.

"PARTICULARS RELATIVE TO THE GREAT ASCENDANCY OF THE POPES THROUGHOUT CHRISTENDOM, IN THE MIDDLE AGES."

Fox commences this section with the following string of assertions:—"In the introduction will be found an account of the rise and progress of Popery, from the commencement of its usurpations to the tenth century. From this period till the Reformation was attempted by Wickliffe, the abominations of these arch and unchristian heretics increased with rapid strides, till at length all the sovereigns of Europe were compelled to do them the most servile homage. It was in the reign of Edgar, king of England, that monks were first made spiritual ministers, though contrary to the decrees and custom of the church; and in the time of this sovereign, they were allowed to marry, there being no law forbidding it before the papacy of Gregory VII.

"To relate the tyrannical innovations upon the religion of Christ, during the space of more than three hundred years, would be the province of a writer on church history, and is quite incompatible with our limits. Suffice it to say, that scarcely a foreign war or civil broil convulsed Europe during that period, which did not originate in the infernal artifices of popes, monks, and friars. They frequently fell victims to their own machinations; for, from the year 1004, many popes died violent deaths: several were poisoned; Sylvester was cut to pieces by his own people; and the reigns of his successors

were but short. Benedict, who succeeded John XXI., thought proper to resist the emperor Henry III., and place in his room Peter, king of Hungary ; but afterwards, being alarmed by the success of Henry, he *sold* his seat to Gratianus, called Gregory VI. At this time there were three popes in Rome, all striving against each other for the supreme power, viz. Benedict IX., Sylvester III., and Gregory VI., but the emperor Henry coming to Rome, displaced these three monsters at once, and appointed Clement the Second, enacting that henceforth no bishop of Rome should be chosen but by the consent of the emperor. Though this law was necessary for tranquillity, yet it interfered too much with the ambitious views of the cardinals, who accordingly exerted themselves to get it repealed ; and failing in this, on the departure of the emperor for Germany, they poisoned Clement, and at once violated the law by choosing another pope, without the imperial sanction.

“ This was Damasus II., who being poisoned, within a few days from his appointment, much contention took place. Whereupon the Romans sent to the emperor, desiring him to give them a bishop ; upon which, he selected Bruno, a German, called Leo IX. This pope was poisoned in the first year of his popedom.

“ After his death, Theophylactus made an effort to be pope, but Hildebrand, to defeat him, went to the emperor, and persuaded him to assign another bishop—a German—who ascended the papal chair under the title of Victor II. The second year of his papacy this pope also followed his predecessors, like them, being poisoned.

“ On the death of Victor, the cardinals elected Stephen IX. for pope, contrary to their oath, and the emperor's assignment. From this period, indeed, their ascendancy was so great, that the most powerful sovereigns of Europe were obliged to do them homage ; and Nicholas, who succeeded Stephen, established the Council of the Lateran. In this council first was promulgated the terrible sentence of excommunication against all such as ‘do creep into the seat of

Peter, by money or favour, without the full consent of the cardinals ;' cursing them and their children with the anger of Almighty God ; and giving authority and power to cardinals, with the clergy and laity, to depose all such persons, and call a council-general, wheresoever they will, against them. Pope Nicholas only reigned three years and a half, and then, like his predecessors, was poisoned."—pp. 121, 122.

In what part of the introduction the rise and progress of Popery are to be found we have not been able to discover. There is no precise period stated, nor any particular dates, whereby we can trace the accuracy of the assertions here made. When did Popery commence ? This question never has been correctly answered. Some have fixed it at one period, some at another, but none agree on the same point. Now, Catholics can tell the exact time when every heresy of note was broached, from the days of Simon Magus to those of Martin Luther, and downwards. The theories put forth by the heresiarchs are always distinguished by the names of the inventors ; as Arianism, from Arius, the heretic ; Donatism, from Donatus, the broacher of that error ; Pelagianism, from Pelagius, who taught it ; Lutheranism, from Luther, the apostle of the Reformation, so called ; Calvinism, from Calvin, a branch spreader of the Reformation ; and so on of the three or four hundred different sects into which this land of bibles is now divided. But the same cannot be said of that system which Protestant writers term Popery. The word is derived from the title of Pope, given to the bishop of Rome, who is, by divine right, supreme head of the Catholic or universal church. Of these bishops there were more than one hundred in the first nine centuries of the Christian church, but not one of them can be selected by *name* as the institutor of Popery, or the inventor of heresy, though Fox is pleased to style them in the gross "arch and unchristian heretics." It must not be forgotten that in the seventh century Fox allows the Catholic church to have been ORTHODOX ; for he ranks the holy pope Martin amongst *his* martyrs, and says he was an opposer of the heresy of Monothelism, and that he

called a council of 105 bishops, who unanimously condemned the errors of that sect. This pope was martyred in 655; in the next century, we find Fox admitting another martyr into his calendar, who received his commission from Rome to *preach the gospel* to the Pagans, and extirpate heresy. This martyr is St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany, who suffered in 755. This was the middle of the eighth century; so that we have brought the time into a small compass, and yet not a *date* nor a *name* can be given for the origin of Popery, unless, indeed, we go back to the apostles themselves, from whom the church is styled Apostolic as well as Catholic.

It is stated by Fox, that "from this period (the tenth century) till the *Reformation* was *attempted* by Wickliffe, the abominations of these arch and unchristian heretics (the popes) increased with rapid strides, till at length *all* the sovereigns of Europe were *compelled* to do them the most *servile* homage." These popes were strange fellows, truly; and how did they go to work to *compel* all the *sovereigns* of Europe, every one of them, to render their holinesses the most *servile* homage? There must have been something supernatural in "these arch and unchristian heretics," which no other heretics possessed, to perform such feats as these. To *compel* kings and emperors, whether tyrants or fathers of their people, to render them the most *servile* homage, is no less than a miracle, and heretics were never able to claim one of these gifts of the Divine Being. That the sovereigns of Europe rendered homage to the popes at this time cannot be denied; but it was not a servile homage; it was only that spiritual obedience which is now given to the head of the Catholic church by sovereigns in her communion, and it was in consequence of their receiving the light of faith from missionaries sent by their authority. The "abominations" which increased with "such rapid strides," were the *blessings* imparted by the conversion of the nations of Europe to the Catholic faith, an account of which advantages, both spiritual and temporal, we have given in our relation of the conversion of this island to Catholicism.



Fox goes on to say, that monks were first made spiritual ministers in the reign of our Edgar, contrary to the decrees and customs of the church; and that in this monarch's time they were allowed to marry, there being no law forbidding it till the papacy of Gregory VII. We thank the martyrologist for this statement, because we have something that is tangible, and can prove it *false* by the test of authentic history. In Rapin's History of England, there is a long speech of Edgar's to the council which he had assembled, for the reformation of abuses and the correction of manners. In this speech the monarch inveighs in strong terms against the incontinent lives of the clergy, which he said was a scandal to the people, and a public complaint. This author, commenting on the dissolute lives of the clergy in this age, says, "It must be observed, the popes had FOR SOME TIME *prohibited the clergy from marrying*, and were very severe to all who refused to comply with their decrees." This is the testimony of a Calvinist writer, who cannot be charged with any partiality towards Catholics. The assertion, then, made by Fox, that there was no law forbidding the marriage of the clergy before the popedom of Gregory VII., is proved to be FALSE by Protestant evidence. We will now introduce a witness of another character, whose work has received the approbation of the most learned and eminent personages of the present day. Speaking of Edgar's days, Dr. Lingard says, in his History; "The tranquillity of Edgar's reign, his undisputed superiority over the neighbouring princes, and his attention to the welfare of his people, have contributed to throw a lustre around his memory: the reformation of the church, undertaken by the prelates, and effected with the aid of his authority, though it was received with gratitude by his contemporaries, has been marked with unmerited censure by modern writers. The Danish invasion had both relaxed the sinews of ecclesiastical discipline, and dissolved the greater number of the monastic and clerical establishments. The most opulent monasteries had been laid in ruins by the rapacity of the barbarians; and their lands, without an owner,

had been seized by the crown, or had been divided among the nearest and most powerful thanes. Under former kings, efforts had been made to restore the monastic order, but they had proved ineffectual. The prejudices against it were nourished by the great proprietors now in possession of its ancient revenues; even the monastery of Ethelingey, which Alfred had peopled with foreign monks, had been gradually deserted: and the two abbeys of Glastonbury and Abingdon, the fruits of the zeal of Dunstan, had been dissolved by the resentment of Edwy. The clerical order was more fortunate. Though shattered and disfigured, it had survived the tempest. But the friends of religious severity, when they compared the clergy of their day with the clergy of ancient times, saw much in their conduct to lament and correct. Formerly they had lived in communities, under particular regulations: and their seclusion from temporal pursuits insured the faithful discharge of their spiritual functions. But during the Danish wars they had been dispersed amidst their relatives, had divided among themselves the revenues of their respective churches, and, substituting others for the performance of the service, indulged in the pleasures and dissipation of the laity. But that which gave particular offence to the more devout was their marriages. It is most certain, that during the two first centuries of the Saxon church the profession of celibacy was required from every clergyman advanced to the orders of priest, or deacon, or sub-deacon: but amid the horrors of successive invasions the injunctions of the canons had been overlooked or condemned: and, on many occasions, necessity compelled the prelates to ordain, for the clerical functions, persons who had already engaged in the state of matrimony. Similar causes had produced similar effects in the maritime provinces of Gaul; and Dunstan had witnessed, during his exile, the successful efforts of the abbot Gerard to restore the ancient discipline in the churches of Flanders. Animated by his example, the metropolitan made a first essay to raise the monastic establishments from their ruins: and his labours were zealously seconded by two active co-operators, the

bishops Oswald and Ethelwold. The former governed the church of Worcester; the latter, his favourite disciple, had been placed, at his request, in the see of Winchester. To them Edgar was induced to sell, or grant, the lands of the monasteries, which had fallen to the crown; and of those which remained in the hands of individuals, a portion was recovered by purchase, and still more by the voluntary resignation of the possessors. Persons were soon found ready to embrace an institute recommended by the prelates and sanctioned by the king; as fast as buildings could be erected they were filled with colonies of monks and their novices; and within a few years the great abbeys of Ely, Peterborough, Thorney, and Malmsbury, rose from their ashes, and recovered the opulence and the splendour which they had formerly enjoyed. The next object of the metropolitan was the reformation of the more dissolute among the clergy, principally in the two dioceses of Winchester and Worcester. For this purpose a commission was obtained from Rome, and a law was enacted, that every priest, deacon, and sub-deacon should live chastely, or be ejected from his benefice."

From this passage it will be seen that the monks *did* exercise spiritual functions before Edgar's reign, and that the celibacy of the clergy was a discipline of the church in the first period of the Saxon church. In fact the rule was coeval with Christianity, though in the early ages marriage was permitted in some cases. On this subject we will give another authority, who has treated the matter very elaborately, and who stands unimpeached as a controversialist and historian. The Right Rev. Dr. Milner, in his excellent *History of Winchester*, says, "It would be too tedious a task to cite all the canons made in the primitive church against the marriage of bishops, priest and deacons. Let it suffice to refer to Concil. Elib. can. xxxiii. 2 Concil. Cathag. can. ii. 1 Concil. Œcum. Nicen. can. iii. 2 Concil. Arelat. can. ii. St. Jerom, in the fourth age, testifies that, in the three great patriarchates of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, no persons were received amongst the clergy, but such as were either

single men, or entirely separated from their wives. *Liber adversus Vigilant.* The testimony of the learned bishop, St. Epiphanius, is to the same effect. *Hæres.* 59. Not to multiply quotations, the centuriators of Magdeburg allow, that, about the time of the conversion of our ancestors, a synod was held by St. Gregory the Great, in which an anathema was pronounced against bishops, priests, or deacons, who should presume to marry. Cent. x. f. 642. The discipline of the Greek church, in subsequent times, became less strict in this point, than that of the Latin church. Its bishops did not refuse to ordain married persons to serve amongst the inferior clergy, (for no prelate, even amongst them, was ever allowed to have a wife); hence even their schismatical council, called Quinisext, or In Trullo, after their separation from the Latin church, utterly condemned the contracting of marriage when a person was once initiated into holy orders, and such their discipline has remained down to the present day. With respect to our ancient English church, if the truth must be told, we are bound to say, that its discipline was strictly conformable to that of the Latin church in general, of which it formed a part, and of course, that it was *never* lawful for any clergyman in holy orders, whether secular or regular, to enter into the married state: nor could any married man, unless he was first separated from his wife by mutual consent, ever be ordained to the higher orders. This we may gather, in the first place, from the above quoted passage of Venerable Bede, according to which, only those who were *not in holy orders* were allowed, in any case whatever, to marry or live in the married state. The same is still more clear from another passage of that primitive author, whom Camden calls the friend of truth. In his exposition of the first chapter of St. Luke, having observed that the priests of the old law were obliged to be continent only during the stated times of their ministry, he goes on: ‘but now an injunction is laid upon priests to observe chastity continually, and ever to abstain from the use of marriage, to the end that they may always assist at the altar.’ It does not appear that any of the clergy

ever attempted to infringe this law, until after the confusion which followed the Danish devastations, in 860. Soon after this we find Pulco, archbishop of Rheims, congratulating king Alfred on the firm and zealous conduct of his primate Plegmund, in extirpating what he calls the error of those who held it lawful for the clergy to marry. Flodoard. His. Rhemens. l. iii. In the reign of king Edmund, viz., in 944, we meet with the particulars of a great synod, as it was called, held at London, by the two archbishops and a great number of prelates, and other considerable personages; in the very first ordinance of which it is enjoined, "that all, initiated in sacred offices, shall be careful, as their state requires, to lead their lives chastely, whether they be men or women, which, if they fail to do, let them be punished as the canon enjoins." Spelman, De Concil. The same learned writer proves from the Penitential, which he publishes, that bishops, priests, and deacons, no less than monks, were conceived, in those times, to be guilty of a great crime if they ever returned to the state of marriage, which they had renounced at their ordination. This brief dissertation may serve to rectify the mistaken notions which modern readers may have hastily taken up on this point of ecclesiastical history, from Parker, Godwin, Tanner, H. Wharton, Carte, Hume, the late historian of Winchester, and other ignorant or interested writers. Amongst others comes forward, at the present day, a writer, who has miserably waded beyond his depth, wherever he has ventured to treat of ecclesiastical antiquities. Speaking of the revolution in the church of Worcester, which took place at the same time with that mentioned above in our cathedral, he says, 'The popes had found it their interest to exact celibacy from the clergy; they incited the monks to raise an outcry against those who, instead of devoting their whole time to spiritual employments, gave a part of it to the company of their wives, &c. Priests that were members of the cathedral colleges had not as yet been restrained from marrying.' Valentine Green's *History of Worcester*, p. 26. From this passage it appears that the writer had never met with a



single canon, or ecclesiastical authority, enforcing clerical celibacy, anterior to the tenth century, and that he ascribes the measures then taken by king Edgar and St. Dunstan, St. Oswald, and St. Ethelwold, to certain negotiations between them and the popes, and to some new laws which the latter had just then enacted on this subject for their own interest. It was incumbent on him to have pointed out the negotiations and laws in question. Unfortunately, however, too many of the popes in that age were abandoned to licentiousness themselves, instead of watching over the morals of the other clergy. The true policy of this original law of clerical celibacy, after all the sagacity of modern writers, will be found in 1 Cor. chap. vii. v. 32, 33."

Such clear documentary evidence as we have here produced must, we imagine, put the question to rest; at least it is sufficient to satisfy every reasonable mind, and we know not what can be adduced to convince those who are determined to remain in their error. On the subject of celibacy in the clergy, much might be offered in a political point of view, and we cannot help considering those, who advocate the married life of men, whose sole duties should be to labour in the Lord's vineyard, very ill-advised, as far as regards their own interest and the country's welfare. In the time of Catholicism, the provision made for the clergy did not go solely to fill their own coffers, nor to maintain their own families. They *voluntarily* embraced a single life, and they engaged to perform duties which it would be unjustifiable to call upon a married man to execute. For instance, in the time of pestilence, or of an individual infected with a contagious disease, the consolations of religion are not to be denied to the afflicted. But who is to convey these consolations to the dying under such circumstances? It cannot be expected that a married clergyman would rush into danger which might affect his own life, and thus leave his wife and family destitute; or, by carrying home the infectious effluvia, cause the pestilence to spread in his family, and though he might escape, yet sip the cup of affliction in the



loss of his wife and children. We have learned at the time we are writing, of a young Catholic priest, eminent for his talents and abilities, falling a sacrifice to this act of godlike charity, in Dublin; and the same disregard of life to impart the cheering and soothing comforts of religion to the infected poor of his flock, has deprived the Catholics of Manchester of a faithful servant of God, in the very prime of his life. Many are the instances where Catholic priests thus fall victims to their zeal and total disregard of life, in the exercise of their sacred duties; but how few, if any, can be produced of Protestant clergymen thus offering themselves in sacrifice. Nor is it to be expected, when they are clogged with the cares of a family, and have the temporal happiness of others depending on their own existence. The Catholic priest, on the other hand, is unencumbered with these ties; he has voluntarily embraced a single life, that he may become a father to the flock over whom he is placed, and when grim death meets him in the discharge of his pastoral duties, he cheerfully resigns his life, to render an account of his stewardship to his heavenly Lord and Master.

Besides, how inconsiderate must it be in a people, to provide not only for the clergy, but for the families of the clergymen. In this country, for example, since the Reformation, as it is called, the provisions for the church establishment, except that portion which fell into lay hands, go entirely to support the clergy, and is not found to be sufficient for that purpose, as many hundreds of thousands of pounds sterling have been lately voted away by parliament, to relieve the poorer part of the clergy. Whereas, when the church establishment was in the hands of the Catholic clergy, they had the poor, and sick, and aged to maintain; the churches to build and repair, and the rights of hospitality to fulfil, out of their income. To which we must add, that they contributed too, out of their revenues, to carry on the wars in which the sovereigns were engaged, either to secure the safety, or to preserve the honour of the country; by which

means the people were eased of taxes, and a national debt was unknown. But now, alas! the case is altered. Taxes are raised to support the poor; taxes are raised to repair and build churches; taxes are raised to relieve the poor clergy and their families; and taxes are raised to pension off many of the sons of the clergy in the shape of half-pay officers and clerks in government offices. And is it wise, is it prudent, when the country is in such a situation, to rail at the economical and judicious regulations of the Catholic church, and our Catholic ancestors respecting the celibacy and provisions of the clergy? Of all the cavils raised against the doctrines and discipline of the Catholic church, this we cannot help deeming the most stupid and besotted. Even granting the practice was not introduced till the time of the seventh Gregory, so wise a regulation ought to immortalize his name at least with the patriot and the statesman.

Having disposed of this disputed point, we come now to the next charge made by Fox. He says, "to relate the *tyrannical innovations* upon the *religion of Christ* during the space of *more* than three hundred years, would be the province of a writer on church history, and is quite incompatible with our limits. Suffice it to say, that scarcely a foreign war or civil broil convulsed Europe, during *that* period, which did not originate in the *infernal artifices* of popes, monks, and friars."

If we are to believe this account, the world must have been in a very comfortable state, and true religion must have been banished from the earth. We commend the modern editors however, for declining to be church historians, as they must have convicted themselves in that case. But what are we to make of the "more than three hundred years?" They tell us that all the evils which arose during "*THAT PERIOD*" originated with popes, monks, and friars. What are we to gather from "*that period*?" We have no *specified* time stated; how then are we to ascertain what foreign wars or civil broils are alluded to? This is all froth and fury. Tell us the innovations, who made them, and when they were in-

roduced. It would not take up much space to *name* ONE of them, nor can it be incompatible with truth to give us a plain fact. The most authentic writers on church history give a very different account of the conduct of these popes, and represent them as the healers of division, and the arbiters of justice between the sovereigns of Europe, and frequently between rulers and the people. We are ready to admit that in the tenth century, when the continent of Europe was subjected to intestine wars, entered into by rival chieftains, there were many popes whose lives were a scandal to the high and sacred office they filled. But these were personal vices, and by no means affected the truth and purity of that church of which they were the head, any more than the tyrannical or lewd conduct of a king of England could sully the excellent maxims of the British constitution. The faith of the church could not be effected by the personal crimes of her chief pastors, because her existence does not rest on the individual merit of any man, but on the power and promises of a crucified God, her Divine Founder, who declared that she should remain pure and unsullied, both in faith and morals, till the end of the world, and we have seen her stand immoveable and unspotted for more than eighteen hundred years. As a proof of our assertion, history records that while Rome was the seat of scandal as well as of religion, the northern nations of Europe were receiving the light of the gospel, and becoming civilized and good Catholics. Hungary, Prussia, Poland, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden, were converted to Christianity in the tenth century. A glance too at the annals of our own country will shew, that in this age lived an Alfred, an Edgar, and an Edward, to whom we are indebted for the best of our political institutions, and whose memory reflects honour on the country, and the religion by which they were influenced to confer such benefits on mankind.

We have next a confused account of a pretended resistance of pope Benedict to the emperor Henry III.; of this pope *selling* his seat to Gregory VI.; of there being three popes at one time; of the emperor going to Rome, displacing “these

monsters," and ordering that henceforth no bishop of Rome should be chosen without the consent of the emperor ; of the discontent of the cardinals at this law, and their poisoning two other popes. Many of these circumstances we are unable to trace in history, and therefore it cannot be expected that we should go into the whole detail of them. We cannot find the least appearance of a breach between Henry and Benedict, and the former is represented by the authors in our possession as a good and pious prince. There were certainly antipopes, but nobody troubled their heads about them. If we can prove but *one* brazen falsehood against Fox in this long list of assertions, the rest must lose their credit. To come, then, to the point. The period we are treating of is the eleventh century : Fox says, the order of Henry did not suit the ambitious views of the *cardinals*, and that they violated his commands by poisoning one pope and choosing another. Now the cardinals had not the privilege of electing a pope till 1160, if we can credit a little work before us, called *The Tablet of Memory*, and this fact is confirmed by the Rev. Alban Butler, who, in his life of St. Leo IX., says : "After the death of pope Damasus II. in 1048, in a diet of prelates and noblemen, with legates and deputies of the church of Rome, held at Worms, and honoured with the presence of the pious emperor Henry III., surnamed the Black, Bruno, who had then governed the see of Toul twenty-two years, was pitched upon as the most worthy person to be exalted to the papacy. He being present, used all his endeavours to avert the storm falling on his head ; and begged three days to deliberate upon the matter. This term he spent in tears and prayers, and in so rigorous a fast that he neither eat nor drank during all that time. The term being expired, he returned to the assembly, and (hoping to convince his electors of his unworthiness,) made public a general confession before them of the sins of his whole life, with abundance of tears, which drew also tears from all that were present ; yet no man changed his opinion. He yielded at last only on condition that the whole clergy and people of Rome should agree to his promo-

tion." They did agree, and *thus* was Leo elected. Fox says, he was poisoned in the first year of his popedom ; now, unfortunately for Fox's veracity, Leo filled the see of Rome **FIVE YEARS AND TWO MONTHS**, and died a natural and holy death. This pope condemned the error of Berengarius, in a council held at Rome, in 1050, the year after he was chosen pope, and died on the 10th of April, 1054, in the fiftieth year of his age. So much for Fox's pope-poisoning and cardinal-electing.

Another mistake made by Fox, is the succession of Stephen IX. after Victor II., and his election by cardinals. Stephen IX. succeeded Leo VII. in 939 ; it was Stephen X. that followed Victor II., and his election being in 1057, the cardinals could not have elected him contrary to their oath, because they were not, as we have before shewn, empowered at that time to choose the sovereign pontiffs. Nicholas, who succeeded Stephen, is said to have established the " council of the Lateran." This is gross falsehood. The first council of Lateran was held in the year 1123, and Nicholas, who was the second of that name, died in 1061 : the " terrible sentence of excommunication," alluded to by Fox, thus turns out to be a fable, invented to alarm the tremulous, as are also his stories about these different popes being poisoned.

We now come to another tale, which he has placed under a special head, and entitled, " **SUBMISSION OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV. TO THE POPE.**" As we like fair play, we shall give the story in the martyrologist's own words :—" To such a height had papal insolence now attained, that, on the emperor Henry IV. refusing to submit to some decrees of pope, Gregory VII., the latter excommunicated him, and absolved all his subjects from their oath of allegiance to him : on this he was deserted by his nobility, and dreading the consequences, though a brave man, he found it necessary to make his submission. He accordingly repaired to the city of Canusium, where the pope then was, and went barefooted with his wife and child to the gate : where he remained from morning to night, fasting, humbly desiring absolution, and craving to be



let in. But no ingress being given him, he continued thus three days together : at length, answer came, that his holiness had yet no leisure to talk with him. The emperor patiently waited without the walls, although in the depth of winter. At length, his request was granted, through the entreaties of Matilda, the pope's paramour. On the fourth day, being let in, for a token of his true repentance, he yielded to the pope's hands his crown, and confessed himself unworthy of the empire, if he ever again offended against the pope, desiring for that time to be absolved and forgiven. The pope answered he would neither forgive him, nor release the bond of his excommunication, but upon condition, that he would abide by his arbitrement in the council and undergo such penance as he should enjoin him ; that he should answer to all objections and accusations laid against him, and that he should never seek revenge ; that it should be at the pope's pleasure, whether his kingdom should be restored or not. Finally, that before the trial of his cause, he should neither use his kingly ornaments, nor usurp the authority to govern, nor to exact any oath of allegiance from his subjects, &c. These things being promised to the pope by an oath, the emperor was only released from excommunication."

Where Fox found this pretty relation he does not tell us, as, according to his usual custom, there is neither date nor authority, to vouch for his facts. We should be glad to have seen such a tyrant (for such was Henry IV., in a superlative degree) thus reduced to a sense of humility ; but this was not the case with this emperor Henry. Father Parsons gives us a very different account of this affair, in his reply to Fox, and names many writers at the time, who represent Gregory VII. as a learned, wise, and courageous man ; while the emperor is described as an immoral and depraved character. Platina Sabellicus, and others, record the election of this pope in these terms :—" We have chosen this day, the 21st of May. 1072, for true vicar of Christ, a man of much learning, great piety, prudence, justice, constancy, and religion," &c. Lambert of Aschafnaburg also saith : " The signs and miracles



which oftentimes were done by the prayers of pope Gregory VII., and his most fervent zeal for the honour of God and defence of ecclesiastical laws, did sufficiently defend him against the venomous tongues of detractors." This is the character given by authentic writers of this pope, which we could multiply, were it necessary, but enough has been said to shew he was not the person Fox makes him. Let us now look at the description of Henry IV., for whom Fox has so much pity and compassion. We will here give an account from father Parsons.

"But what do the same authors, yea, Germans themselves, write of their emperor, his enemy, Henry IV.? Surely it is shameful to report his adulteries, symoniacal selling of benefices, robberies, and spoiling of poor particular men, thrusting in wicked men into places of prelates, and the like: 'He did request the princes of the empire (saith Lambert) that they would suffer him to put away his wife, telling them what the pope by his legate had opposed to the contrary.' Which being heard by them, they were of the pope's opinion: the princes affirmed, that the bishop of Rome had reason to determine as he did, and so the king (rather forced than changed in mind) abstained from his purposed divorce.

"Lo here the first beginning of falling out betwixt the emperor and the pope; which was increased, for that two years after (as the same author saith) the pope deprived one Charles for simony and theft, to whom the emperor had sold for money the bishopric of Constance. And this he did by a council of prelates and princes, held in Germany itself, the emperor being present: 'Bishop Charles (saith Lambert) was deposed, notwithstanding that the king was present in that judgment, and defended him and his cause as much as he could.' *Lamb. Schaf. A. D. 1071.* And this was an increase of the falling out between them; but the constancy (saith the same author) and invincible mind of Hildebrand against covetousness, did exclude all arguments of human deceits and subtilties. *Ibid.*

"Urspergensis, in like manner, who lived in the same time, reckoneth up many particulars of the emperor's wicked be-

haviour in these words: 'He began to despise the princes, oppress the nobles and nobility, and give himself to incontinency.' *Usrp. A. D.* 1068. Which Aventinus (an author not disliked by the Protestants) uttereth more particularly in these words: 'The very friends of Henry the emperor do not deny that he was infamous for his wicked life and lechery, fornication, and adultery.' *Lib. 4. Annalium Boiorum.*

"And finally, not to name any one, Marianus Scotus (that lived in those days) writeth thus of the whole controversy between them:—Gregory VII. (saith he) being stirred up by the just clamours of Catholic men, and hearing the immanity of Henry the emperor's wickedness, cryed out against by them, did excommunicate him for the same, but especially for the sin of simony, in buying and selling bishoprics; which fact of the pope did like very well all good Catholic men, but displeased such as would buy and sell benefices, and were favourers of the said emperor." *Mar. Scot. Inchron. A. D.* 1075.

Thus wrote the learned Father Parsons, more than two hundred years ago, who was well acquainted with the authorities he has quoted, and who, it appears, lived cotemporary with Gregory and Henry, and must therefore have been in perfect possession of the facts they stated. The Rev. Alban Butler, who compiled the life of this holy pope from some of the ablest and most authentic writers of that and succeeding ages, enters more deeply into the transactions between Gregory and Henry. He confirms the testimony of Father Parsons as to the character of this prince, who fell, when young, into the hands of ambitious and unprincipled men, by whom his passions were inflamed and indulged, that they might carry on their own vicious designs. Hence, by his tyranny and injustices he provoked his own subjects, and caused the princes and nobility of the empire to appeal to the pope. It must here be observed, that the lives of some of the higher orders of the clergy were scandalous in the extreme, and that many of them had been guilty of simony, having *purchased* their bishoprics of Henry. Gregory, who was ex-

alted to the papacy by compulsion, and with the consent of Henry, was no sooner seated in the chair of Peter, than, like a good and pious pontiff, he meditated a reform in the morals of the clergy, as the best and surest means of producing a general change for the better. Accordingly, he called a council at Rome, and after due deliberation, a decree was passed, by which all persons guilty of simony were declared incapable of receiving any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and disqualified for holding any benefice whatever. This mandate was of course not pleasing to those bishops who had purchased their benefices from the emperor, and who were not willing to part with them; they therefore made complaint to Henry, who espoused their cause. This monarch, like all other tyrants and oppressors, could dissemble when it served his ends, and accordingly he wrote a letter to Gregory on his exaltation to the papal see, condemning himself for having sold the benefices of the church, and promising amendment. This pope answered him in terms of the greatest charity and apostolic zeal. But when Henry found Gregory inflexible in the pursuit of a reformation in the conduct of the clergy, he shewed that his former professions of repentance were dictated by hypocrisy, and he resolved to continue the patroniser of corruption and exaction. Pursuing this determination, on the 23rd of January, 1076, he assembled at Worms a conventicle of simoniacal bishops, who presumed to depose Gregory from the pontificate on the most shallow pretences. Henry sent this mock sentence to Rome, together with a contumelious letter. On the receipt of this sentence and letter, Gregory called a council at Rome, and declared the emperor and his schismatical adherents excommunicated; and he further took upon him to pronounce that Henry, for his tyranny and oppressions, had forfeited his right to the crown.

That Gregory had a right to excommunicate Henry and his adherents cannot be doubted, since the affair for which he was condemned was one of *spirituals*. With the affairs of the church the temporal power has no jurisdiction. Henry therefore could not depose the pope without creating a schism,

and for this, he was liable to exclusion from the benefit of the sacraments. By the sentence of excommunication he was cut off from receiving any part of the treasures of the church; but the decree of deposition was quite a different thing. Christ had left no power in his church to depose sovereigns, nor would he admit the power of sovereigns to interfere with his kingdom; the general opinion of those times, however, had constituted the reigning pope, from the nature of his high office, a kind of arbiter or judge in the disputes which arose between contending sovereigns, or the discontents which might occur between a sovereign and the nobles and people. In this case the pope acted not by divine right, but by general consent; and if kings, and princes, and people alike, are content to refer their temporal concerns to the head of the church, that head cannot be blamed for using his best endeavours to see justice done to each party, by the removal of public abuses and the establishment of just laws. This was the aim of Gregory VII., and for this most praiseworthy and honourable intention, he is the subject of invective and calumny.

The reader will now perceive the *cause* of the decree issued by Gregory, and the motives which induced Henry to refuse submission. We must now notice Fox's pathetic tale of the *barefooted* pilgrimage of Henry, his wife, and child, and the three days' sojournment before the walls of the pope's palace, into which he is said to have gained admission at last through the entreaties of a lady named Matilda, and said to be the pope's paramour. By the name of the pretended paramour we are inclined to believe that this lady is no other than the countess of Tuscany, who was the daughter of Beatrice, sister to the emperor Henry III., by her husband Boniface, Lord of Lucca, and was therefore cousin to the emperor Henry IV. She was a woman of great virtue and heroism, and the wife of Guelpho, the younger duke of Bavaria. Her mother, Beatrice, and herself, were great admirers and protectresses of Gregory, and were directed by his counsels in the paths of perfection; it is not therefore likely, but is

evidently a gross calumny, that Matilda was a paramour of the pope, who was too serious in his design to bring the clergy to a state of continency to violate it himself.

The sentence of Gregory against Henry, added to his own oppressions and misconduct, caused the princes of the empire to assemble in diet, to take into consideration the state of the empire, and to decide whether Henry should be any longer their emperor. This state of things, and the repentance of many of his adherents, alarmed Henry, and he set off to Rome to obtain a reconciliation with the pope, as the sure way to preserve his crown. The monarch put on the garb of penitence, and begged an audience, but Gregory, knowing his former insincerity, kept him in suspense till the fourth day, when they were reconciled on certain conditions, the emperor promising to make all the satisfaction in his power for the injuries he had committed. The conditions of this reconciliation, as related by Fox, are fabulous, as the subsequent conduct of the monarch will clearly shew. This part of the history Fox has *suppressed*, but it is necessary to be known, in order to clear up the mist thus thrown around it. Gregory, with the sincerity of an upright man, sent off a messenger instantly to the princes of Germany, informing them of the important reconciliation, and requesting them to suspend their deliberations, until he and Henry should appear amongst them. Henry, on the contrary, like all dissemblers, made excuses, and tried to prolong his appearance, and that of the pope in the assembly. The council or diet of the princes, was held at Foreheim, in Franconia, the members of which, growing weary of delay, and expecting no good from a faithless sovereign, proceeded to the election, and on the 15th of March, 1077, chose Rodolph, duke of Suabia, for their emperor.

Henry, finding his enemies resolute, and not being disposed to part with his crown without a struggle, the seeds of civil war were sown, and a contest was carried on, with various success, for three years. The death of Rodolph, who fell in battle, left Henry sole master of the empire; and elated with



victory, he renewed his violence against the church, summoned a crowd of simoniacal prelates to depose the pope, and publish again the mock deposition. Gregory, in consequence of this arbitrary and insulting conduct, renewed his former censures against Henry, who, full of revenge, marched an army into Italy, set up an antipope, and laid siege to the city of Rome. The pope shut himself up in the castle of St. Angelo, where he remained secure till Robert Guiscard, the heroic duke of Calabria, relieved the city and caused Henry to retreat into Lombardy. Though again master of Rome, the spirit of party ran so high, that Gregory deemed it most prudent to retire, which he did, first to Monte Cassino, and then to Salerno, where he fell sick, and ended his days on the 25th of March, 1085. Thus then this pope, who is reprobated for his insolence, which we are told had attained, at this time, a formidable height, died a proscribed exile, through the villanies and intrigues of a man, who is held out to the people of England as an object of pity. The last words of Gregory were: "I have loved justice and have hated iniquity, therefore I die in a strange land." Gifted as this pontiff was with the most heroic qualities and amiable virtues, it would have been a wonder if his character had not been assailed by some writers, and more especially by those who are interested in keeping up similar abuses which Gregory opposed, and who hate that system of religion of which he was the head. His own writings, however, will bear testimony against these slanders, and when we add the evidence of a writer, by no means partial to any pope, we may consider the character of Gregory as rescued from foul blots, which unjust authors have attempted to cast upon it. Dupin, a French author, says: "It must be acknowledged that pope Gregory VII. was an extraordinary genius, capable of great things; constant and undaunted in the execution; well versed in the constitution of his predecessors; zealous for the interests of the Holy See; an enemy to simony and libertinism (vices which he vigorously opposed); full of Christian thoughts and of zeal for the reformation of the manners of



the clergy ; and there is not the least colour to think that he was not unblemished in his own morals. This is the judgment which we suppose every one will pass upon him, who shall read over his letters with a disinterested and unprejudiced mind. They are penned with a great deal of eloquence, full of good matter and embellished with noble and pious thoughts ; and we boldly say, that no pope since Gregory I. wrote such fine and strong letters as this Gregory did."—*Du Pin*, Cent. 11, ch. 1, pp. 67, 68.

As to the emperor Henry IV., after carrying on the contest with three of Gregory's successors, his own sons rebelled against him, and joined the malcontents. In these contests he suffered the severest checks of fortune, and died at Liege, in the year 1106, and 46th of his age, leaving behind him a name odious for his execrable lust, refined hypocrisy, and barbarous cruelties. Yet such a character as this has Fox enlisted among his auxiliaries to traduce and defame the religion of the primitive Christians, and the successors of the apostles.

The next story is headed,—“KING JOHN SURRENDERS HIS CROWN TO THE POPE;” which occurrence he gives in these words:—“The ascendancy of the popes was never more fully evinced than by a remarkable fact in the history of our own country. King John, having incurred the hatred of his barons and people, by his cruel and tyrannical measures, they took arms against him, and offered the crown to Louis, son of the French king. By seizing the possessions of the clergy, John had also fallen under the displeasure of the pope, who accordingly laid the kingdom under an interdict, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance. Alarmed at this, the tyrant earnestly sued for peace with his holiness, hoping, by his mediation, to obtain favourable terms from the barons, or, by his thunders, to terrify them into submission. He made the most abject supplications, and the pope, ever willing to increase the power of the church, sent cardinal Pandulf as legate to the king, at Canterbury, to whom John resigned his crown and dominions ; and the cardinal, after

retaining the crown five days, in token of possession, returned it to the king, on condition of his making him a yearly present of 1000 marks to the court of Rome, and holding the dominions of England and Ireland *in farm*, from the pope. But if John expected any benefit from this most disgraceful transaction, he was disappointed; and instead of enjoying the crown, which he had so basely surrendered and received again, the short remainder of his life was disturbed by continual insurrections, and he at last died either of grief, or by poison, administered to him by a monk of the convent of Swineshead, in Lincolnshire. The latter cause is assigned by many historians, and we are told that the king, suspecting some fruit that was presented to him, at the above convent, to be poisoned, ordered the monk who brought it to eat of it, which he did, and died in a few hours after."

As this subject is most obscurely given in this passage, and as the transactions in this king's reign are of great interest, even at this moment, and, as well as the days of Alfred, will require to be referred to, in our examination of Fox's account of the Reformation, we will here enter somewhat copiously into the principal facts of the reigns of Alfred and John, as regard the religious and political institutions of those times, and the influence which religion had on these two monarchs in wielding the sceptre. We have already shown *how* the Catholic religion was introduced into this kingdom, under the Saxon heptarchy, in the sixth century, and the beneficial effects it produced on the manners and dispositions of our converted ancestors. By the advice of the prelates, the guardians of faith and morals, laws founded on the true principles of justice were established under the best and wisest of their kings; and when the ravages of war and the turpitude of sovereigns had debased the morals of the people, the clergy were the foremost to seize the opportunity, whenever one was offered, to bring the nation back to a state of virtue and happiness. In this pursuit, they always found the best and most efficient aid in a religious and active monarch. Such was the renowned Alfred, whose deeds as a Christian, a soldier, and a

statesman, reflect a lustre on that religion by which they were influenced. This great monarch was the fourth and youngest son of Ethelwolph, the pious king of the West Saxons, and the second sovereign of all England. He was born at Wantage, in Berkshire, in 849, and at an early age was sent to Rome. Leo IV., who then filled the chair of St. Peter, adopted him as his son, and the foundation of those virtues, which afterwards shone with such brilliancy in his actions, was no doubt laid in his heart by the instructions he received at the papal court. How then can that religion be inseparable from persecution, which leads the mightiest monarchs to establish the most equitable laws? And how can the men be monsters, as Fox and his editors represent the popes to have been, who planted such noble feelings in the minds of our Alfred, and those other British sovereigns whose names glitter in the page of history, and throw a dark shade on the vices of those monarchs who rejected and violated the principles of their religion?

Alfred came to the crown in the 22nd year of his age, when the Danes were pouring their hordes into the kingdom, and sweeping everything before them. Various were the vicissitudes he experienced in his endeavours to recover the kingdom from the invaders, and at last he was driven to the extremity of seeking safety in some woody and boggy parts of the county of Somerset. Here he lay hid for six months, employing himself in prayer and meditation, and listening to the instructions of his spiritual director. In this state of exile, several of our best historians relate, that falling into a slumber, he received an assurance from St. Cuthbert that God would shortly restore him to his kingdom. Encouraged by this vision, Alfred renewed active operations, and succeeded in reconquering the kingdom, making the Danes surrender to his prowess, and acknowledge him victor. The first use he made of his triumph was to grant liberty of conscience to the Danish prisoners, by allowing those who did not choose to become Christians to return to their own country; those who embraced the faith were settled in the kingdom of the East

Angles. He next turned his attention to maritime affairs, and founded that navy which has raised British glory so high among the nations of the world. The arts, sciences, and literature then occupied his notice, and he also employed himself in erecting castles, fortresses, churches, and monasteries, which had been overthrown by the devastation of the Danes. But that which raised Alfred's name above the rest of our monarchs, was the indefatigable assiduity and superior wisdom he manifested in bringing about a reformation of abuses, and laying the foundation of British freedom.

"Nothing," writes the Rev. Alban Butler, in a note to the Life of St. Neot, a near relative of Alfred, "is more famous in the reign of this king, than his care and prudence in settling the public tranquillity of the state, by an exact administration of justice. In the preceding times of war and confusion, especially whilst the king and his followers lurked at Athelney, or up and down, and in cottages, the English themselves became lawless, and in many places revolted and plundered their own country. Alfred, by settling a most prudent polity, and by a rigorous execution of the laws, restored so great a tranquillity through the whole kingdom, that, according to the common assertion of our historians, if a traveller had lost a purse of money on the highway, he would find it untouched the next day. We are told in *Brompton's Chronicle*, that gold bracelets were hung up at the parting of several highways, which no man durst presume to touch.

"Alfred compiled a body of laws from those of Ina, Offa, and Ethelbert, to which he added several new ones, which all tended to maintain the public peace and safety, to enforce the observance of the divine precepts, and to preserve the respect which is due to the church and its pastors. For crimes they inflict fines or mulets, proportioned to the quality and fortune of the delinquent; as, for withholding the Peterpence, for buying, selling, or working on the Lord's day or holiday, a Dane's fine was twelve ores or ounces, an Englishman's thirty shillings: a slave was to forfeit his hide, that is,

to be whipped. The mulct of a Dane was called *Lash-lite*; that of an Englishman *Wear-wite*, or gentleman's mulct. Were or Weregild was the mulct or satisfaction for a crime; it was double for a crime committed on a Sunday or holiday, or in Lent. By these laws it appears that slaves in England enjoyed a property, and could earn for themselves, when they worked at times in which they were not obliged to work for their masters; in which they differed from strict slaves of whom the Roman laws treat. Alfred's laws were mild, scarce any crimes, except murder, being punished with death; but only with fines, or if these could not be paid, with the loss of a hand or foot. But the severity with which these laws were executed, maintained the public peace. Alfred first instituted trials to be determined by juries of twelve unexceptionable men, of equal condition, who were to pass judgment upon oath as to the evidence of the fact or crime; which is to this day one of the most valuable privileges of an English subject. To extirpate robberies which, by the confusion occasioned by Danish devastations, were then very common, this king divided the kingdom into shires (though there were some shires before his time), and the shires into hundreds, and the hundreds into tythings or tenths, or in some places into wapentakes, and every district was made responsible for all robberies committed within its precincts. All vagabonds were restrained by every one being obliged to be enrolled in some district. The capital point in Alfred's administration was, that all bribes or presents were most rigorously forbid the judges, their conduct was narrowly inspected into, and their least faults most severely punished. Upon any information being lodged against a judge or magistrate, he was tried by a council, established for that purpose by the king, who himself presided in it; he is said to have condemned in one year forty-five judges to be hanged, for crimes committed by them in their office. By this severity he struck a terror into all his magistrates; and such was the effect of his perspicuity and watchfulness in this respect, that, as Milton says, in his days justice seemed not to flourish only, but to triumph.



“ This prince, who was born for everything that was great, was a lover and zealous patron of learning and learned men, He considered that arts and sciences cultivate and perfect those faculties in men in which the excellency of their nature consists, and bestow the empire of the mind, much more noble, pleasant, and useful than that of riches; they exceedingly enhance all the comforts and blessings of life, and extend the reputation and influence of a nation beyond any conquests. By this encouragement of learning have so many great geniuses been formed, to which the world stands most indebted; and to this the greatest nations owe their elegance, taste, and splendour, by which certain reigns have been distinguished. By what else did the golden elegant ages of Rome and Athens differ from the unknown brutal times of savage nations? Certainly nothing so much exalts the glory of any reign, or so much improves the industry and understanding, and promotes the happiness of a people, as the culture of leading geniuses by well regulated studies. As Plato says, (1. 6. de leg.) man without culture and education is the most savage of all creatures which the earth nourishes. But sciences are still of infinitely greater importance with regard to religion; and this consideration above all others, recommended the patronage of learning to this pious king. The ancient public schools being either destroyed, or almost fallen to decay with the monasteries during the wars, Alfred founded the university of Oxford. Alfred, canon of Beverly, in 1120, writes in his manuscript history, that king Alfred stirred up all gentlemen to breed their sons to the study of literature, or if they had no sons, some servants or vassals whom they should make free. He obliged every free man who was possessed of two hides of land, to keep their sons at school till they were fifteen years of age, for, said the king, a man born free, who is unlettered, is to be regarded no otherwise than a beast, or a man void of understanding. It is a point of importance, that persons of birth, whose conduct in life must necessarily have a strong and extensive influence over their fellow-creatures, and who are designed by Providence to be



charged with the direction of many others, be formed from their infancy to fill this superior rank which they hold with dignity, and to the general advantage of their species. In order to be qualified for this purpose, their tender hearts must be deeply impressed with the strongest and most generous sentiments of sincere piety and religion, and of true honours: by being inured to reason in their youth they must acquire a habit of reasoning well and readily, and of forming right judgments and conclusions. Their faculties must be raised and improved by study, and when, by passing through the circle of the sciences, their genius has been explored, their studies and employs ought to be directed into the channel, which, by their rational inclinations, talents, particular duties, and circumstances of life, the great Author of nature and Master of the world shall point out to each individual. King Alfred also exhorted the noblemen to choose, among their country vassals or villains, some youth who should appear by parts and ardent inclinations to piety, particular promising to be trained up to the liberal arts. As for the rest, it was not then the custom to give the poorer sort too much of a school education, which might abate their industry and patience at manual labour. But this prince was solicitous that care should be taken for the education and civilizing of all, by religious instructions and principles. Agriculture, in the first place, and all the useful and mechanical arts never had a greater patron or protector."

Who can have the hardihood, after this account of the transactions of Alfred, to charge the Catholic church with a desire to keep her children in ignorance? Nothing but the most barefaced impudence and bigotted prejudice could induce a man to utter so groundless a falsehood. Do we not here see, in the ninth century, the strenuous exertions of a Catholic king, seconded by the Catholic clergy, in founding seminaries of education, and imparting the advantages of learning to those who seek them. These schools and colleges were preserved, and others added to them, out of the revenues of the church and through the piety of the clergy, till the

rapacious Henry the Eighth came to the crown, when, taking it into his head to become a religious tinker, he and his successor seized upon most of these seats of knowledge, and destroyed the learned labours of their inhabitants. Camden, the panegyrist of Elizabeth, in his introduction to the *Annals* of that queen, says: "England sate weeping to see her wealth exhausted, her coin debased, and her abbeyes demolished, which were the monuments of ancient piety;" while another writer, Sir John Denham, speaking of this scene of desolations, exclaims,—

"Who sees these dismal heaps but will demand,  
What barbarous invader sack'd the land!  
But when he hears no Goth, no Turk, did bring  
This desolation, but a Christian king;  
When nothing but the name of zeal appears  
'Twixt our best actions and the worst of theirs,  
What does he think our sacrilege would spare,  
Since these th' effects of our devotion are."—*Cooper's Hill*.

Of Alfred, on the contrary, Sir Henry Spelman (*Conc. Brit.*) speaks thus in strains of rapture: "O, Alfred, the wonder and astonishment of all ages! If we reflect on his piety and religion, it would seem that he had always lived in a cloister; if on his warlike exploits, that he had never been out of camps; if on his learning and writings, that he had spent his whole life in a college; if on his wholesome laws, and wise administration, that these had been his whole study and employment." Such is the character given to Alfred, who, we wish the reader to bear in mind, was a CATHOLIC king, governed by the divine precepts of the CATHOLIC church, while the "few plain Christians" tell us that the Catholic religion is inseparable from persecution, and its professors bloodthirsty and superstitious.

We must now return to the martyrologist. Fox says: "The ascendancy of the popes was never more fully evinced than by a remarkable fact in the history of our own country;" which fact turns out to be the surrender which John made of the crown of England to Innocent III. This fact he has taken care to envelope in much darkness, and when placed in its true light, the ascendancy of the popes in those days will

appear to be not half so pernicious as the ascendancy of an Orange faction of our own. It is confessed by Fox, that John was hated by the barons and people for his cruel and tyrannical measures, and that they offered the crown to Louis, son of the French king. It is true they did so; and it is also true that this offer was made subsequent to the surrender of the crown by John to Innocent, so great was the ascendancy of the popes in those days! Fox places this circumstance *before* the affair between the king and the supreme pontiff, whereas, as we have just said, it should have been *after* the mighty resignation. The case was this: John was a faithless and perfidious character; he divorced his wife and murdered his nephew, which latter crime drew upon him the indignation of his subjects; and the Bretons, in particular, swore to be revenged on the murderer. His foreign dominions in Normandy were attacked, and John was compelled to retire to England, where he raised forces, and applied to the pope to compel his antagonist, the French king, by ecclesiastical censures, to observe his engagements.

It must be here noticed, that at the period we are treating of, the principle upon which our ancestors were governed was the feudal system; and it was no uncommon thing to see the king of England doing homage as *the vassal* of the king of France, and the king of Scotland swearing fealty to the king of England; the one for territories held in Normandy, the other for lands held under the English crown. Hence in many of these disputes, when the fate of arms was doubtful, or had turned out disastrous, the sovereign pontiffs were appealed to as the common father of Christendom, to use their spiritual influence, which was almost invariably exercised on the side of justice. In the case with John, the pope entered warmly into the affair, and endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation. The matter, however, turned out disastrous to the English monarch's interests, and he soon found himself involved in a dispute with Innocent himself.

In those times, the choice of a bishop was not as now, a mere matter of course, at the will of a minister, but a canoni-

cal election was deemed necessary, and the church being independent of the state, in point of *spirituals*, a rigid adherence to forms was the consequence. It happened that the see of Canterbury became vacant, and John wanted to put one of his own creatures into the primate's chair ; the monks, who had a right of election, differed from the king, and elected another candidate ; but fearing John's displeasure, they disregarded the first choice, and made a selection of John de Grey, bishop of Norwich, according to the recommendation of the king. As this was an affair that regarded the spiritual jurisdiction of the church, recourse was had to the pope, who pronounced both elections void, and ordered a canonical one to be entered into, when Stephen Langton, an Englishman of great eminence and learning, who had been honoured by Innocent with the purple, was chosen, and his election confirmed by the pope. The bishop of Norwich not being willing to loose the object of his ambition, insinuated bad advice into the ear of his royal master, who refused to acknowledge Langton, and, in the fury of disappointment, he turned his rage upon the monks, seized on their revenues, and banished them from the kingdom. Innocent tried, by persuasive means, to bring the king to a state of reason and justice, but he was inexorable ; three bishops, by order of the pope, beseeched him in the most moving terms, to accept the new bishop, but he only answered them with oaths and insults. The king was then laid under an interdict, and was subsequently excommunicated, in the hope of bringing him over to justice. John continued to deride these measures till he found the barons were not to be relied upon, so great was their detestation of his conduct and injustices, and his crown was threatened by his rival, the French king. He was then panic-struck, and in a fit of guilty cowardice, he resigned the crown into the hands of the pope's legate, and swore fealty to the Roman see. Fox insinuates, that this transaction originated in the willingness of the popes to increase the power of the church ; but if this were the case, Innocent must have felt himself much disappointed, his power not having received the least

augmentation by the transaction, as we shall find in the sequel.

The king being reconciled, the new archbishop Langton was allowed to take possession of his see and the revenues thereof. The first act of the archbishop, on revoking the sentence of excommunication, was, we are told by Dr. Lingard, to make the king swear, "that he would abolish all illegal customs, and revive the laws of the good king Edward." John took the oath, but he did not mean to keep it, so perfidious was his disposition. Some of the barons having fallen under the king's displeasure, he resolved to punish their disobedience by military execution. In this resolution the monarch found himself opposed by the noble minded and honest archbishop, who reminded him that it was the right of the accused to be tried by his peers. John disregarded his admonitions, on which the archbishop told the king, says the last named author, that if he "persisted to refuse them the justice of a trial, he should deem it his duty to excommunicate every person, with the exception of the king himself, who should engage in so impious a warfare. John yielded with reluctance, and for the sake of form, summoned the accused to appear on a certain day before him or his justices." This conduct of the archbishop may be thought by some as insolent and disrespectful to the sovereign; but to those who admit that a monarch holds his crown for the people, it will appear an act of the purest patriotism, and shew how beneficial it is that churchmen should not owe their situations to the crown, but be independent of ministerial influence for their elevation.

The continued treachery and vexations of John induced the cardinal archbishop to seek other measures to ensure the safety of persons and property from the lawless rapacity of the king. Accordingly, at a meeting of the barons at St. Paul's, he called them aside, read to them the chapter of liberties confirmed by Henry I., and commented upon its provisions. The barons swore upon oath to conquer or die in defence of their liberties. The reader will observe that



during these proceedings, John held his crown in fealty to the pope, and was courting his support against the barons, as well as against the king of France, with whom he was at war. The contest with France proved unsuccessful, and John, having concluded a truce of five years, returned to England to receive further mortification. On the 20th of November, 1214, the barons met at the abbey of St. Edmundsbury, where they took a solemn oath before the high altar, to demand in a body of the king, a redress of their grievances and a restoration of their civil liberties. This was done accordingly, and the king demurring, both parties appealed to the pope, who took the part of his vassal, John. In a letter to Langton he condemned the conduct of the barons as unjust, accused the archbishop of being the fomentor of the dispute, and commanded him to exert all his authority to restore harmony between the king and his subjects. The question was not one of *spirituals*, but a political struggle for temporal claims, and Langton knew how to distinguish between the two authorities. While he bowed submission to Innocent as head of the church, he declined to obey his mandate as lord paramount of the state, when the command was contrary to the rights and interests of the nation. Thus, when the cardinal primate was urged by the legate and the bishop of Exeter to excommunicate the barons, Langton refused to listen to their propositions, and told them that unless John dismissed the foreign troops he had introduced into the kingdom, he should think it his duty to oppose them with all his power. The barons thus fortified by this courageous dignitary of the church, again pressed their demands on the king, who wished to refer the question to the pope, but the barons refused to let the matter be sent to Rome, and at length obtained, on the plains of Runnymede, the signature of the king to that charter of liberties which is referred to at the present day as one of the fundamental pillars of British freedom, and is called the Great Charter.

Thus it is clear, that whatever might be the ascendancy of the popes, and however disgraceful the conduct of John



might be in surrendering the crown to Innocent, a Catholic cardinal and bishop, and Catholic barons and knights, knew how to treat this ascendancy when it stood in the way of their rights and grievances. The idea of the dominions of England and Ireland being held *in farm* from the pope, may suit some prejudiced minds, but the page of history will prove that none were more attached to the *see* of Rome, on subjects of spiritual jurisdiction, nor more opposed to the *court* of Rome, when the rights and independence of the country were interfered with, than our Catholic ancestors. They knew, as we have before observed, how to distinguish between the two authorities, and if they occasionally appealed to the pope to heal any differences between crowned heads, or between the rulers and the people, when any stretch of power was exerted on the part of the pontiffs, there were always professors of the canon and civil law to point out the act of encroachment, and all parties were at liberty to abide by it or reject it. So much for this mighty bugbear, which was conjured up to alarm the haters of Popery out of their senses, as well as out of those liberties which our Catholic forefathers were so tenacious in preserving.

After John had signed the charter of liberties, he used every endeavour to render the privileges granted by it nugatory, and sought to wreak vengeance on the heads of those who were instrumental in forcing him to sign that important document. His cruelties were unparalleled, and his rapacity insatiable; which induced the barons to offer the crown to Louis, the son of the king of France. Louis accepted the offer, and an unsuccessful attempt was made by the pope's legate to prevent both father and son from invading a kingdom, which, he said, was a fief of the holy see. Here we have another proof how little the pretended ascendancy of the popes was regarded, when it stood in the way of kingly ambition. The fact is, as we have frequently repeated, and it ought not to be forgotten, the ascendancy of the popes arose from the high situation they held, and the general opinion entertained of their virtues and learning, and love of

justice. Innocent III., like Gregory VIII., was a divine renowned for his great knowledge and stern integrity. Of Innocent, who governed the church eighteen years, Blondus, amongst other authors, writes thus: "The fame and odour of this pope's gravity, holiness of life, and greatness of actions, was most sweet throughout all France," &c. (*Blond. decad.* 2. l. vii. p. 297.) The Rev. Alban Butler says, that Innocent III. was "famous for his great actions, and for several learned and pious books which he composed." There are writers, to be sure, who have endeavoured to blacken the fame of this eminent pontiff, but their slanders are evidently the effect of malicious or prejudiced minds, and, therefore, wholly unworthy of credit. Innocent convened the fourth general council of Lateran, and condemned the Albigenses; it is, therefore, no wonder that he should be abused by Fox and his modern editors, the "few plain Christians," who claim so near a kindred in religion with that impious and diabolical sect.

Let us now see what the character of John was from the best historians. Dr. Lingard thus describes it: "When Geraldus delineated the characters of the four sons of Henry, John had already debased his faculties by excess and voluptuousness. The courtly eye of the preceptor could indeed discover the germ of future excellence in his pupil; but history has recorded only his vices: his virtues, if such a monster could possess virtues, were unseen or forgotten. He stands before us polluted with meanness, cruelty, perjury, and murder; uniting with an ambition which rushed through every crime to the attainment of its object, a pusillanimity which often, at the sole appearance of opposition, sank into despondency. Arrogant in prosperity, abject in adversity, he neither conciliated affection in the one, nor excited esteem in the other. His dissimulation was so well known, that it seldom deceived: his suspicion served only to multiply his enemies; and the knowledge of his vindictive temper contributed to keep open the breach between him and those who had incurred his displeasure. Seldom, perhaps, was there a

prince with a heart more callous to the suggestions of pity. Of his captives many never returned from their dungeons. If they survived their tortures, they were left to perish by famine. He could even affect to be witty, at the expense of his victims. When Geoffry, archdeacon of Norwich, a faithful servant, had retired from his seat at the exchequer on account of the interdict, the king ordered him to be arrested, and sent him a cope of lead to keep him warm in his prison. The cope was a large mantle, covering the body from the shoulders to the feet, and worn by clergymen during the service. Wrapt in this ponderous habit, with his head only at liberty, the unhappy man remained without food or assistance till he expired. On another occasion, he demanded a present of ten thousand marks from an opulent Jew, at Bristol, and ordered one of his teeth to be drawn every morning till he should produce the money. The Jew was obstinate. The executioners began with his double teeth. He suffered the loss of seven; but on the eighth day solicited a respite, and gave security for the payment.

“John was not less reprehensible as a husband, than he was as a monarch. While Louis took from him his provinces on the continent, he had consoled himself for the loss in the company of his beautiful bride; but he soon abandoned her to revert to his former habits. The licentiousness of his amours is reckoned by every ancient writer among the principal causes of the alienation of his barons, many of whom had to lament and revenge the disgrace of a wife, or daughter, or sister.”

We have here given a faithful account of the circumstances which occurred between Henry IV. of Germany and Gregory VII., and John of England and Innocent III., together with a true character of these respective personages from the best authorities. It will here be seen that the auxiliaries pressed by Fox into his cause are of the most worthless and irreligious cast, whose crimes bring discredit on human nature, and whose deeds are a blot on the history of nations. On the other hand, the “infernal artifices” attributed by him to the

“popes, monks, and friars,” we find have led to the most beneficial consequences, and have been the means of exalting the human mind; extending the arts and sciences through every country where Catholicism was planted, and in none more so than in our own beloved island, as the remains of our ancient buildings, and the stately cathedrals that now adorn the kingdom bear testimony. The foreign wars and civil broils that convulsed Europe are also imputed to these “infernal” artificers; with how much truth let the admirable laws and regulations of those days, in our country, the work of the most pious kings and learned divines, bear witness. We have shewn *how* the Catholic religion was planted by the care of popes in this country, and how the purest maxims of justice and civil government were established under its benign influence; another picture now remains to be unfolded, in which the depravity of error will appear in that light which Fox and his modern editors have endeavoured to cast upon the ministers and disciples of the Catholic church.

Before we enter on this comparison, we must be allowed to lay before our readers another delectable tale by the martyrologist, which he has headed thus: “AN EMPEROR TRODDEN ON BY THE POPE.” Oh horrible!! Who could ever have supposed such a thing? The popes must be “monsters” indeed to tread upon emperors! But let us see what Fox himself says on this extraordinary deed. “The papal *usurpations*,” he writes, “were extended to every part of Europe. In Germany, the emperor Frederic was compelled to submit to be trodden under the feet of pope Alexander, and dared not make any resistance. In England, however, a spirit of resentment broke out in various reigns, in consequence of the oppressions and horrible conduct of those anti-christian blasphemers, which continued with more or less violence till the time of the great Wickliffe, of whom we shall speak more fully in the following pages.” (Page ii., 23.)

Can any one refrain from smiling at this account by Fox? These German emperors, according to his account, must have been shocking base dastards, to have submitted to such

humiliation. But they "*dared* not," he says, "make any resistance!" No, indeed! *who* was to prevent them? Tell us by *what* power, and under *what* authority, the popes were so exalted and the emperors so humbled. Let us have chapter and verse, and do not let this tale rest on bare assertion. We have shewn that Henry II. attacked the pope with arms in his very capital, and is it likely that an emperor, (we cannot say whether a *predecessor* or *successor* of this Henry, for we cannot tell by the relation of Fox which of the popes named Alexander it was, there having been *seven* of that name, nor which emperor called Frederick, of whom there had been *four*,) is it likely, we say, that an emperor would submit to such an indignity, or that a pope, whose interest it must have been to live in peace and amity with a powerful sovereign, would require such an act of submission from a monarch? No man of unclouded mind can ever believe it; nor could such a story ever have gained credit in this country, had not the people been previously hoodwinked and begulled out of their wits.

But though the German emperors were such cowards, our ancestors, it seems, were not to be humbled and trodden upon by "those *anti-christian blasphemers*," as Fox and his editors call the popes. A "spirit of resentment," it is said, "broke out in the various reigns." Well, and why not *specify distinctly* the reigns in which this spirit made its appearance, and the *cause* of its appearing? There is history to refer to, and by making this reference a disposition would have been manifested to court inquiry into the truth of the fact. That some opposition was made to the *temporal* encroachments of some of the popes is what no Catholic will deny; nay, our best Catholic writers frequently mention the stand made by our ancestors in terms of praise, and cite these instances as a proof of the spirit of *independence*, not of resentment, that animated the Catholics of those days, denominated by silly ignorant bigots the "days of darkness." However, as Fox says he shall speak more fully of these days, in his account of Wickliffe, we shall do the same, and follow him inch by inch in his catalogue of falsehoods.



## "SECTION II.

"ACCOUNT OF WICKLIFFE AND OF THE MARTYRS WHO  
SUFFERED IN DEFENCE OF HIS DOCTRINES."

This is a most important period in the history of our country, and deserves much attention. According to his custom, Fox introduces his account with a mixture of truth and falsehood, of facts and fictions, well calculated to work on the generous credulity of Englishmen, who are proverbial for their dislike of everything oppressive, and their attachment to justice; but who are unfortunately so misled by the misrepresentations and falsehoods of interested writers, that they mistake error for truth, despotism for freedom, and wrong for justice. The following are the introductory remarks made by Fox, regarding the errors of John Wickliffe.—“The first attempts made in England towards the reformation of the church took place in the reign of Edward III., about A. D. 1350, when John Wickliffe appeared. This early star of the English church was public reader of divinity in the university of Oxford, and, by the learned of his day, was accounted deeply versed in theology, and all kinds of philosophy. This even his adversaries allowed, as Walden, his bitterest enemy, writing to pope Martin, says, that he was wonderfully astonished at his strong arguments, with the places of authority which he had gathered, with the vehemence and force of his reasons, &c. At the time of his appearance, the greatest darkness pervaded the church. Scarcely anything but the name of Christ remained; his true doctrine being as far unknown to the most part, as his name was common to all. As to faith, consolation, the end and use of the law, the office of Christ, our impotency and weakness, the greatness and strength of sin, of true works, grace, and free justification by faith, wherein Christianity consists, they were either unknown or disregarded. Scripture learning and divinity were known but to a few, and that in the schools only, where they were



turned and converted into sophistry. Instead of Peter and Paul, men occupied their time in studying Aquinas and Scotus; and, forsaking the lively power of God's spiritual word and doctrine, were altogether led and blinded with outward ceremonies and human traditions, insomuch that scarcely any other thing was seen in the churches, taught or spoken of in sermons, or intended or sought after in their whole lives, but the heaping up of ceremonies upon ceremonies; and the people were taught to worship no other thing but that which they saw, and almost all they saw they worshipped. But Wickliffe was inspired with a purer sense of religion; and, knowing it to be his duty to impart the gracious blessing to others, he published his belief with regard to the several articles of religion, in which he differed from the common doctrine. Pope Gregory XI., hearing this, condemned some of his tenets, and commanded the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London to oblige him to subscribe the condemnation of them; and in case of refusal, to summon him to Rome. This commission could not easily be executed, Wickliffe having powerful friends, the chief of whom was John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, son of Edward III. The archbishop holding a synod at St Paul's, Wickliffe appeared, accompanied by the duke of Lancaster and lord Percy, marshal of England, when a dispute arising whether Wickliffe should answer sitting or standing, the duke of Lancaster proceeded to threats, and treated the bishop with very little ceremony. The people present, thinking the bishop in danger, sided with him, so that the duke and the earl marshal thought it prudent to retire, and to take Wickliffe with them. After this an insurrection ensued, the clergy and their emissaries spreading a report that the duke of Lancaster had persuaded the king to take away the privileges of the city of London, &c., which fired the people to such a degree, that they broke open the Marshalsea, and freed all the prisoners: and not contented with this, a vast number of them went to the duke's palace in the Savoy, when missing his person, they plundered his house. For this outrage the duke of Lancaster caused

the lord mayor and aldermen to be removed from their offices, imagining that they had not used their authority to quell the mutineers. After this, the bishops meeting a second time, Wickliffe explained to them his sentiments with regard to the sacrament of the eucharist, in opposition to the belief of the Papists; for which the bishops only enjoined him silence, not daring at that time to proceed to greater extremities against him." (Page ii., 24, 25.)

The martyrologist is not correct even at the commencement; the attempt of Wickliffe and his followers were not to *reform*, which means to change from worse to better, but to *deform*, that is, to disfigure, to dishonour the church, and convulse the state. In the first case, however, he was frustrated, as we shall presently shew, by the watchful eye of her Divine Founder, and the vigilance of her lawful pastors; in the latter he was unfortunately more successful. The greatest *darkness*, we are told, pervaded the *church* at the time of Wickliffe's appearance, and the true doctrine of Christ, it is said, was *unknown* to the most part of the world. "*Scripture learning* and divinity were known but to a few, and that in the schools only, where they were turned and converted into sophistry. Instead of Peter and Paul, men occupied their time in studying Aquinas and Scotus, and the people were taught to worship no other thing but that which they saw, and almost all they saw they worshipped." These are bold assertions, but a little reflection, and a slight glance at sacred and profane history, will soon show how groundless they are. Christ has said, that his words should not fail; that his church should be guided by the Spirit of Truth; that the gates of hell should not prevail against her; that she should continue one and the same to the end of the world; and that she should never be obscured by the mist of darkness, but should be like a city placed on the top of a mountain, a light and guide to all men. These are plain and unequivocal texts from Scripture, which every one may read and *understand* too, unless reason is perverted, and the brain is disordered with chimerical notions. Now, then, how could the church

be pervaded with darkness, unless the promises of Christ became void? And is there a man laying claim to the name of a Christian, who has the hardihood openly to avow that Christ has failed in his promise? Fox calls the popes "anti-christian blasphemers," but, is he not here a blasphemer himself, in asserting that the church was at one time in darkness, in opposition to the promises made by God, that the church never should be in darkness?

But it was not *wholly* in darkness, it may be said; a spark of the gospel was still treasured up, to burst forth upon the world, and chase away the abominations of Popery. This is a fine flight of imagination, and much used by the adversaries of the Catholic church, to lull the credulous into belief. However, let us look to the history of the world, and see how this light shone forth, and how the darkness, as it is called, enveloped it. We have, in our first volume, displayed the progress of Christianity in the early ages of the church, and shewn how the errors of dogmatizers were detected and condemned, and that the greatest care was taken by the pastors of the Catholic church, either by general councils, or provincial synods, or written epistles, or word of mouth, to condemn every species of novelty, and caution the people to beware of the deceits of designing men, whose object was to involve them in confusion, and ensnare them in the meshes of error. We have shewn that Fox himself admitted the right of the pope to assemble synods, and condemn heretics. He has classed the holy pope Martin amongst his "godly martyrs," and praised him for condemning the errors of the Monothelites; nor has he, in one single instance, shewn any authority by which the popes were deprived of that right which he has allowed them, and which they have exercised from the first foundation of the church to the present day, and will continue to exercise it, in spite of the world and the devil, to the end of time. At the commencement of this volume, we have shewn how the Catholic faith was introduced into this island by missionaries sent from Rome, and the same faith was propagated by missionaries sent by the popes, in all

the different countries of the world, which did not receive it personally from the apostles. Wickliffe began his career about the year 1371, so that England had been in possession of the Catholic faith nearly EIGHT HUNDRED YEARS, had acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of Rome during that time, and was governed in spiritual matters by a regular and unbroken hierarchy. A consecutive list of archbishops and bishops of all and every diocese in the kingdom can be produced from their first foundation to the time when they were displaced by the ruthless hand of Elizabeth, and intruders thrust into the vacant sees, in which they were secured by act of parliament. The kings of England, the emperors of both the eastern and western empires (with the exception of some of the former, who held schismatical opinions, but agreed in point of faith, and were for their disobedience consigned by the vengeance of God to the infidel Mahometans) with the kings of France and the other monarchs of Europe, were all of one faith and one religion with the other. There were in every age a number of the most eminent doctors and professors of divinity, and for some hundred years the monks and friars of England had raised high the character of the country, in point of science, literature, and theology. If they studied Aquinas and Scotus, they also studied Peter and Paul, for Aquinas believed and taught the same doctrines as those blessed apostles received, and preached by the command of their Divine Master. During this period, as in former ages, several synods and councils were held in divers countries, for the suppression of error and sectarianism, which occasionally started up, such as the Bogomilians, Petrobusians, Waldenses, Albigenses, Flagellantes, Begardians, and others, some of which we have noticed in our first volume.

We are told that Wickliffe was *inspired* with a purer "sense of religion; knowing it to be his duty to impart the gracious blessing to others, he published his belief with regard to the several articles of religion, in which he *differed* from the *common doctrine*." This is very true; he *did* differ from the common doctrine, and it was for differing from the

truth, that is from the common faith of the whole world, that he was condemned as a *false* teacher. But he was an inspired man! This assertion may suit the fanatic who deals in private inspiration; the sensible man, however, will require some test to prove his inspiration. From whom did he receive his credentials? Who commissioned him to preach a doctrine, differing from those taught by the apostles, and believed in common by all the world? The fact is, if Wickliffe were inspired, it was by the spirit of revenge, for a disappointment he experienced in losing the wardenship of Canterbury-hall, in Oxford, into which place he had contrived to hedge himself. Wickliffe made his appeal to the pope, who decided against him, which inspired him with fresh resentment, and was the principal cause of his opposition to the pope. He had previously been engaged in a dispute with the friars, and finding himself not likely to obtain the promotion he sought for, he determined to rail against benefices and temporalities generally, to have his revenge on the whole body of the clergy, his own creatures excepted. Such doctrines could not fail to meet with admirers among hungry ambitious courtiers, and as he declaimed also against tithes, the people, who were oppressed at that time, owing to the expensive wars of Edward III., were ready to catch at his doctrine. The novelty and danger of Wickliffe's tenets, and the conduct of his "poor priests," as the fanatics who enlisted under his banners were called, soon became matter of astonishment and complaint. He was summoned by the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London to appear before them. He did so, as Fox relates, accompanied by John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and Percy, the lord marshal. An altercation ensued between these haughty and irreligious peers and the prelates, and the people present certainly sided with the latter, in consequence of the outrageous and insolent behaviour of the peers, whose object was to intimidate their opponents. It is equally true that an insurrection ensued; not, however, from the insinuations of the clergy and their emissaries, as Fox falsely asserts, but through the influence



of Wickliffe's doctrines, which heightened the discontent of the people, whose minds were already soured by taxation and disappointment. To add to the discontent, a new tax was levied of so much a head on every person, according to his rank and estate. As this tax accelerated the rebellion of Wat Tyler, of which so much has been written, and so little is clearly known, and the scale of taxation is very curious, we will here subjoin an abridgment of it, from Dr. Lingard's *History of England*.

	£	s.	d.
1. The dukes of Lancaster and Bretagne were rated at . . .	6	13	4
2. The justices of the king's bench and common pleas, and the chief baron of the exchequer . . . . .	5	0	0
3. An earl, earl's widow, and the mayor of London . . . .	4	0	0
4. A baron, banneret, knight equal in estate to a banneret, their widows, the aldermen of London, mayors of great towns, serjeants at law, and great apprentices of the law . . . . .	2	0	0
5. A knight, esquire who ought to be a knight, their widows, apprentices who followed the law, jurats of great towns, and great merchants . . . . .	1	0	0
6. Sufficient merchants . . . . .	0	13	4
7. Esquires, their widows, the widows of sufficient mer- chants, attornies at law . . . . .	0	6	8
8. Others of less estate in proportion . . . . .	0	3	4
or . . . . .	0	2	0
or . . . . .	0	1	0
9. Each married labourer for himself and wife . . . . .	0	0	4
10. Single men and women, not mendicants . . . . .	0	0	4

Rot. Parl. iii. 57, 58.

The clergy, who possessed the right of taxing themselves, adopted a similar rate.

Archbishops paid . . . . .	6	13	4
Bishops and other spiritual peers . . . . .	4	0	0
All having benefices above the yearly value of 200 <i>l</i> . . . .	2	0	0
From 100 <i>l</i> . to 200 <i>l</i> . . . . .	1	10	0
From 66 <i>l</i> . 13 <i>s</i> . 4 <i>d</i> . to 100 <i>l</i> . . . . .	1	0	0
From 20 <i>l</i> . to 40 <i>l</i> . . . . .	0	10	0
From 10 <i>l</i> . to 20 <i>l</i> . . . . .	0	5	0
All other clergymen . . . . .	0	2	0
Monks and nuns paid per head, according to the value of the houses to which they belonged, 40 <i>d</i> . or 20 <i>d</i> . or 12 <i>d</i> . or 4 <i>d</i> . Wilk. Con. iii. 141, 142.			



From this scale it will be seen that the clergy in those days contributed their fair quota to the exigencies of the state, even of the lowest degree, besides maintaining the poor; but in these days, the days of the blessed Reformation and bible-reading, the people are taxed to maintain the poor clergy as well as the poor laity. Such is the difference between a married and unmarried clergy. We should add, that the above capitation tax falling short of the estimated sum, a further grant was voted by parliament, and the clergy, in a convocation, granted a tax of 6d. 8d. from all prelates, priests, (both regular and secular) and nuns, and of one shilling from deacons and inferior clerks. (*Conc.* iii. 150.) But to return to Wickliffe and his doctrines. At this period there was a great ferment among the mass of the people of all nations, and those of England were encouraged to resist the authorities by the diffusion of the doctrines of Wickliffe, among which he maintained that the right of property was founded in grace, and that no man, who was by sin a traitor to his God, could be entitled to the services of others. Thus a man had only to conceive himself to be in a state of grace, and his neighbour to get drunk, when the latter forfeits his right to property, and the former becomes entitled to it. Such notions as these could not be long entertained without disjoining the scale of society, and we find their propagation by itinerant preachers, who took care likewise to inculcate the natural equality of mankind, and the tyranny of artificial distinctions soon wound the people up to a pitch of madness, and caused them to commit the greatest violences.

To enter into every particular here would occupy too much space, but to shew the effect of these doctrines we will give the words of Stowe, an authority of great repute and much referred to by historians:—"The fame of these doings (that is the murder of the collector, by Wat Tyler, and the subsequent rising of the Kentish-men) spread into Sussex, Hertford, Essex, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, &c., and when such assembling of the common people daily increased, and that their number was now made almost infinite, so that they

feared no man to resist them, they began to shew some such acts as they had considered in their minds, and took in hand to behead all men in law, as well apprentices as utter barristers and old justices, with all the jurors of the country, whom they might get into their hands ; they spared none whom they thought to be learned; especially if they found any to have pen and ink, they pulled off his hood, and all with one voice crying out, ‘ Hale him out, and cut off his head !’ They also determined to burn all court rolls and old monuments, that the memory of antiquities being taken away, their lords should not be able to challenge any right on them from that time forth. These commons had to their chaplain or preacher a wicked priest, called Sir John Ball, who counselled them *to destroy all the nobility and clergy*, so that there should be *no bishop* in England but one archbishop, which should be himself.” This Sir John Ball, the same historian informs us, had employed himself for some years in preaching at “divers places those things which he knew to be liking to the common people, slandering as well ecclesiastical persons as secular lords, seeking thereby rather the benevolence of the common people, than merit towards God ; he taught that tithes were not to be given to churchmen, except the party who should give the same should be richer than the vicar or the parson that should receive it. Also, that tithes and oblations were to be withdrawn from curates, if the parishioners or parishioner were of better life than the curate. Also, that no man was meet for the kingdom of God, that was not born in matrimony.” These and many other things Stowe says he taught, for which he was prohibited by the bishops in whose diocesses he had attempted to spread them ; and as they prevented him from preaching in churches, he went forth into the streets, and highways, and fields, where there wanted not common people to hear him, whom he ever sought to allure to his sermons, by detracting of the prelates. For these seditious practices he was committed to prison, from which he was released by the mob, and, after being thus delivered, he followed them, for the purpose of instigating them to do evil.

“That his doctrines,” writes Stowe, “might infect the more numbers of people, at Blackheath, where they were many thousands of the commons assembled, he began his sermon in this manner:—

“When Adam delved and Eve span,

“Who was then a gentleman ?

“And, continuing his begun sermon, he sought by the word of that proverb, which he took for his theme, to introduce and prove, that from the beginning all were made alike by nature, and that bondage or servitude was brought in by unjust oppression of naughty men against the will of God ; for if it had pleased God to have made bondmen, he would have appointed them from the beginning of the world, who should have been slave and who lord. They ought to consider, therefore, that now there was a time given them by God, in the which, laying aside the yoke of continual bondage, they might, if they would, enjoy their long wished-for liberty. Wherefore he admonished them, that they should be wise, and after the manner of a good husbandman that tilled his ground, and did cut away all noisome weeds that were accustomed to grow and oppress the fruit, that they should make haste to do now at this present the like. First, the archbishop and great men of the kingdom were to be slain ; after, lawyers, justiciars, and questmongers ; lastly, whomsoever they knew likely hereafter to be hurtful to the commons, they should dispatch out of the land, for so might they purchase safety to themselves hereafter, if the great men being once taken away, there were among them equal liberty, all one nobility, and like dignity, one semblable authority or power. These” adds the writer, “and many such mad devices he preached, which made the common people to esteem of him in such manner, as they cried out, he should be the archbishop of Canterbury and chancellor of the realm, for he only deserved the honour.”

At Canterbury several citizens were slain by the insurgents, and in every place they demolished the houses and pillaged the manors of the lords, burnt the court rolls,

and cut off the heads of every justice, lawyer, and juror, who fell into their hands. In Southwark they demolished the houses belonging to the Marshalsea and the King's Bench, forced their way into the palace of the archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth, and burnt the furniture, with the records belonging to the chancery. In the city they demolished Newgate, and set the prisoners free, plundered and destroyed the magnificent palace of the Savoy, and burnt the Temple with the books and records. The next objects of their vengeance were the natives of Flanders, sixty of whom they seized in various parts of the city, and struck off their heads with shouts of savage triumph. They next rushed into the Tower, and laying hands on the archbishop of Canterbury, who was also lord chancellor, Sir Robert Hales, William Apuldore, the king's confessor, Legge, the farmer of the obnoxious tax, and three of his associates, they were instantly led to execution. Walsingham relates the death of the archbishop with much minuteness. His head was carried through the streets on the point of a spear in triumph and fixed on London Bridge; and that it might be better known, the hat or bonnet worn by him was nailed to the skull.

The reader will now be able to judge of the credit due to Fox, who has endeavoured to screen the pernicious and revolutionary tendency of Wickliffe's preachings, by insinuating that the clergy were the instigators of the insurrection, when it is clear, from the testimony of the most authentic writers, that they were the victims and not the factors of the seditious and lawless spirit of those times. As to the duke of Lancaster displacing the lord mayor and aldermen for this remissness, it is one of Fox's numerous fabrications, for Rapin tells us, that the duke was in the north during the rising, and being himself suspected, he retired into Scotland till the storm was appeased, by which time the lord mayor went out of office by regular order. We are then told that, "*after this*, the bishops had a meeting a second time, when Wickliffe explained to them his sentiments with regard to the sacrament of the eucharist, in opposition to the belief of the

Papists ; " that is, of the whole kingdom, and of all Christendom, as there was then no division or contradiction in belief on the real presence either in the Greek or Latin church. For being so kind as to *explain*, the bishops, he says, " only enjoined him to silence, not *daring* at that time, to proceed to greater extremities." We know not whether we ought to smile or feel indignant at the subterfuges practised by the anti-Popery writers, who will never give to the Catholic church her just due. The bishops, in enjoining silence to Wickliffe, only acted according to the mild precepts of their church, and proved by their conduct, that persecution was not an ingredient of their creed. By this false and base writer it is imputed to fear. But what *cause* had the bishops to fear? They had the king and people on their side, by Fox's own shewing. Nay, according to his account, they (the people) had even gone so far as to commit outrages at the instigation of the clergy ; and now in the same breath we are assured, that they dare not punish Wickliffe for fear of the people, or something else. What contradiction have we here, and to diffuse, as it is pretended, " a knowledge and love of the genuine principles of Christianity " among their fellow-believers. The truth is, the bishops were the appointed guardians of " the faith once delivered to the saints ; " they were bound to preserve the truths which they received from their predecessors, who received them from St. Augustin, who had them from the Roman bishop, and this bishop from his predecessors in the see, up to the apostles. They did not act on their own *private* opinion, as Wickliffe did, and as all other heresiarchs do, who depart from the truth, and promulgate error : but they follow the example set them by the apostles in the council of Jerusalem, and by the fathers of the preceding ages of the church in the various councils held to examine into the pretensions of impostors, and explain the real truths of the Catholic faith. The bishops assembled at synod to listen to Wickliffe, to deliberate and to decide. They had to pronounce judgment before the whole kingdom, and if that judgment had been erroneous, is it to be believed



that some one of talent, learning and respectability, would not have taken up the cause of Wickliffe, and denounced the conspiracy of the bishops to lead the people into error, and impugn the truths of the gospel? And yet it is a fact, that not one individual of rank in the school of letters came forward to assist this heresiarch. He could find no followers but those of the most ignorant and depraved cast, and the two peers named patronised him merely to gratify their ambitious intentions and glut a revenge they had long entertained. This we shall see as we proceed in our review of the martyrology.

The next event noticed by Fox is the "great schism in the church of Rome," which we shall treat of hereafter, as it interferes with the subject under discussion. He then proceeds to give an account of Wickliffe, under the head, "WICKLIFFE TRANSLATES THE BIBLE," which we shall transcribe for the amusement of the reader. "Wickliffe," he says, "paying less regard to the injunctions of the bishops than to his duty to God, continued to promulgate his doctrines, and gradually to unveil the truth to the eyes of men. He wrote several books, which, as may be supposed, gave great alarm and offence to the clergy. But God raising him up a protector in the duke of Lancaster, he was secure from their malice. He translated the bible into English, which, amidst the ignorance of the times, may be compared to the sun breaking forth in a dark night. To this bible he prefixed a bold preface, wherein he reflected on the immoralities of the clergy, and condemned the worship of saints, images, and the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament: but what gave the greatest offence to the priests was, his exhorting all people to read the scriptures, in which the testimonies against all those corruptions appeared so strongly. About the same time the common people, goaded to desperation by the oppressions of the nobility and clergy, rose in arms, and committed great devastations; and, among other persons of distinction, they put to death Simon of Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury. He was succeeded by William Courtney, who was no less diligent than his predecessor had been, in attempting to root



out *heretics*. Notwithstanding all opposition, however, Wickliffe's sect increased, and daily grew to greater force, until the time that William Barton, vice-chancellor of Oxford, who had the whole rule of that university, assisted by some monastic doctors, issued an edict, prohibiting all persons under a heavy penalty from associating themselves with any of Wickliffe's favourers; and threatening Wickliffe himself with excommunication and imprisonment, unless he, after three days canonical admonition or warning, did repent and amend. Upon this, Wickliffe wished to appeal to the king; but the duke of Lancaster forbade him; whereupon he was forced again to make confession of his doctrine, in which confession, by qualifying his assertions, he mitigated the rigour of his enemies. Still his followers greatly multiplied. Many of them, indeed, were not men of learning; but being wrought upon by the conviction of plain reason, they were the more steadfast in their persuasion. In a short time his doctrines made great progress, being not only espoused by vast numbers of the students of Oxford, but also by many of the nobility, particularly by the duke of Lancaster and lord Percy, earl marshal, as before mentioned. Wickliffe may thus be considered as the great founder of the reformation in this kingdom. He was of Merton College in Oxford, where he took his doctor's degree, and became so eminent for his fine genius and great learning, that Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury, having founded Canterbury College, now Christ Church, in Oxford, appointed him rector; which employment he filled with universal approbation, till the death of the archbishop. Langholm, successor to Islip, being desirous of favouring the monks, and introducing them into the college, attempted to remove Wickliffe, and put Woodhall, a monk, in his place. But the fellows of the college, being attached to Wickliffe, would not consent to this. Nevertheless, the affair being carried to Rome, Wickliffe was deprived in favour of Woodhall. This did not at all lessen the reputation of the former, every one perceiving it was a general affair, and that the monks did not so much strike at Wickliffe's

person, as at all the secular priests who were members of the college. And, indeed, they were all turned out, to make room for the monks. Shortly after, Wickliffe was presented to the living of Lutterworth, in the county of Leicester, where he remained unmolested till his death, which happened December 31, 1385. But, after the body of this good man had lain in the grave forty-one years, his bones were taken up by the decree of the synod of Constance, publicly burnt, and his ashes thrown into a river. The condemnation of his doctrine did not prevent its spreading all over the kingdom, and with such success, that, according to Spelman, 'two men could not be found together, and one not a Lollard, or Wickliffite.'"

This plausible story has had its day, and too long a day for the cause of truth, and the happiness of the country. It is one of those fashionable themes which have caused hundreds in the present age to part with their money and their wits, to encourage a knot of pretenders not a jot better than Wickliffe himself. He is commended for translating the bible into English; but his greatest offence, we are told, was "his exhorting all people to *read* the scriptures, in which the testimonies against all those corruptions appeared so strongly." What those testimonies and what those corruptions *were* are not pointed out to the reader, so that he is as completely left in the dark concerning them, as the adversaries of Catholicism charge the Catholic priesthood with keeping the people in ignorance respecting the scriptures. At that time the copies of the sacred writings were few, and confined chiefly to the libraries of the monasteries and universities. The great mass of the people, including many of the nobility and gentry, could *not* read, from the want of facility in teaching and the paucity of books, the art of printing not being then discovered, so that the exhortation of the heresiarch to *all* the people to *read* the scripture is a mere fiction, invented to conceal the deception of intriguers and knaves. It is true that Wickliffe translated the scriptures, and that he multiplied the copies as much as he could with the aid of transcribers; and by the aid

of his disciples, who were the off-scum of the clergy, and called "poor priests," he disseminated those texts among the illiterate which favoured his doctrines, by word of mouth, and he inculcated the now favourite and delusive notion of private interpretation, by which he undermined the authority of the church, and set the people and their pastors at variance. Of the novelties preached by Wickliffe, two of them are said to be the condemnation of the worship of saints and the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament. We could have wished for more explicitness. Why did not Fox give us the precise grounds on which Wickliffe rested his condemnation? We have shewn in our first volume, by quotations from the fathers, that the *invocation* of saints was practised and taught in all times by the apostles and doctors of the church; that the opposite doctrine had been condemned as false and erroneous; therefore, that which was false before the time of Wickliffe could not be rendered truth by him, let him be ever so deeply inspired. That Wickliffe was not a Protestant is beyond contradiction, since he inculcated the doctrine of purgatory, and strenuously maintained the efficacy of the mass, both of which Protestants deny upon oath. He also admitted the seven sacraments of the Catholic church, while the Protestants of the church as by law established hold only two, and many deny them altogether. Consequently, if Wickliffe was *right*, Protestants must be *wrong*; and if the latter are *right*, why then the former must be *wrong*, and what becomes then of his being inspired? It could not be by the Spirit of Truth, but must have been by the Father of Lies.

Fox admits that the common people rose in arms, and put several persons of distinction to death: among others Simon Islip, the archbishop of Canterbury, who gave Wickliffe the wardenship of Canterbury college. But then he endeavours to throw the blame upon the clergy as well as the nobility. We have shewn that the clergy were *not* the oppressors and plunderers of the people, but that they contributed to relieve them of a considerable share of taxation, by heavy impositions on every rank of the ecclesiastical order. And if William of

Courtney was diligent in rooting out heretics, he only followed the example of pope Martin, who, as we have before observed, and which should not be forgotten, is extolled by Fox for his vigilance in preserving truth and condemning heresy, and is placed among his "godly martyrs." The term "to root out *heretics*," is here improperly used; because, at this period, there was no law to inflict corporeal punishment on those who had become infected with heresy. It was the *error*, the *heresy*, not the individual contaminated with it, that the clergy were diligent to root out, as it became their duty so to do. The story of Barton, the vice-chancellor of Oxford, issuing an edict of prohibition to *all* persons not to associate with Wickliffe or his followers is another fiction, for Barton had not the authority to issue so general an edict. His jurisdiction extended only to the university of Oxford, of which Wickliffe was not then a member.

But what shall we say to the admission of Fox, that Wickliffe "was *forced* again to make *confession* of his doctrine; in which confession, by QUALIFYING his assertions, he mitigated the rigour of his enemies." Here is a pretty apostle "to unveil the truth to the eyes of men!" He is *compelled* to make a confession of his faith, and in making this confession he *qualifies* his expressions, he softens, that is, he plays the *deceiver*, to mollify his judges, and save himself. What an admission! Who could rely on such a juggling scoundrel? And yet this is a man who is held forth as the precursor of that "blessed" work of robbery, and pillage, and corruption, both in faith and morals, called the *Reformation*. To be sure he was a fit person to precede so irreligious a work, and, as we have shewn, his doctrines were productive of similar disorders, only the wisdom and firmness of the king and his councillors, in those days of darkness, nipped the evil in the bud. How different is this conduct of Wickliffe to the example set by the primitive martyrs? How different to the illustrious and innumerable confessors of the Catholic faith in all ages. They did not want to be *compelled* to make a confession of their faith; they gloried in it, and openly professed

it in the face of their judges and executioners. They never practised the art of dissimulation, as, we are assured by Fox, John Wickliffe did ; but they declared, in plain and unequivocal language, the tenets of their creed, and braved the malice and rigour of their enemies. Wickliffe, however, was not made of such materials ; he did not aspire to be a martyr, and therefore when he appeared before his lawful judges, to render an account of his doctrines, he read a confession of faith with some reluctance, in their presence, which being considered satisfactory, he was allowed to remain in peace, at his rectory at Lutterworth, where he died two years afterwards, whilst assisting at the mass of his curate. That Fox gave a true character of Wickliffe, when he represented him as a *qualifier* of doctrine, is confirmed by Dr. Lingard, who thus describes his manner of managing disputation. "On many points of doctrine," writes the doctor, "it is not easy to ascertain the *real* sentiments of this reformer. In common with other religious innovators, he claimed the two-fold privilege of *changing his opinion at will*, and of being *infallible in every change*; and, when he found it *expedient to dissemble*, could so *qualify* his doctrines with *conditions*, or *explain them away by distinctions*, as to give an *appearance of innocence* to tenets of the most *mischievous tendency*." Here, then, the historian and Fox are agreed, and it cannot now be doubted or disputed that John Wickliffe, the precursor of the Reformation, an inspired reformer of religion, appointed by God, according to Fox, "gradually to unveil the truth to the eyes of men," was a PREVARICATOR and DISSEMBLER!!! He must have been an admirable teacher of truth.

Fox next gives us the "TENETS OF WICKLIFFE ; " that is, those which were condemned as heretical. They are as follow :

1. "The substance of material bread and wine doth remain in the sacrament of the altar after the consecration.
2. "The accidents do not remain without the subject in the same sacrament, after the consecration.
3. "That Christ is not in the sacrament of the altar truly and really, in his proper and corporal person.



4. "That if a bishop or a priest be in deadly sin, he doth not order, consecrate, nor baptize.

5. "That if a man be duly and truly contrite and penitent, all exterior and outer confession is but superfluous and unprofitable unto him,

6. "That it is not found or established by the gospel, that Christ did make or ordain mass.

7. "That if the pope be a reprobate and evil man, and consequently a member of the devil, he hath no power, by any manner of means given unto him over faithful Christians.

8. "That since the time of Urban the sixth, there is none to be received for pope, but every man is to live after the manner of the Greeks, under his own law.

9. "That it is against the scriptures, that ecclesiastical ministers should have any temporal possessions.

10. "That no prelate ought to excommunicate any man, except he knew him first to be excommunicate of God.

11. "That he who doth excommunicate any man, is thereby himself either an heretic or excommunicated.

12. "That all such which do leave off preaching or hearing the word of God, or preaching of the gospel for fear of excommunication, they are already excommunicated, and in the day of judgment shall be counted as traitors unto God.

13. "That it is lawful for any man, either deacon or priest, to preach the word of God, without authority or license of the apostolical see or any other of his Catholics.

14. "That so long as a man is in deadly sin, he is neither bishop nor prelate in the church of God."

Speaking of the 4th article, Father Parsons, in his reply, observes: "Will Fox yield to this article, think you? For, if he do, we may call in doubt whether ever he were well baptised, and consequently whether he were a Christian; seeing it may be doubted whether the priest that baptized him were in mortal sin or no when he did it." Of the ninth, the same learned writer remarks: "This article, if Fox will grant, yet his fellow ministers, and his lords the bishops, I

presume, will hardly yield thereunto, but will pretend scriptures to the contrary *against* Wickliffe." With regard to the first three articles, we refer the reader to the primitive fathers we have quoted in the first volume, who contended for the opposite doctrine, and vouched for the real presence as of divine institution, derived from Christ to the apostles. As to the sixth, which rejects the mass, Wickliffe attended at this sacrifice to the day and hour of his death, as we have before stated. But, what will the modern editors of Fox say to the following tenets, which they have prudently suppressed in these awkward times about tithes.

16. "That temporal lords may, according to their own wills and discretion, take away the temporal goods from any churchmen, whensoever they offend.

17. "That tithes are mere alms, and may be detained by the parishioners, and bestowed where they will at their pleasure."

These are some of the *truths* which Wickliffe thought proper "gradually to unveil to the eyes of men," and we will here ask the reader, if another Wickliffe were to rise up now and preach the same doctrines, whether the clergy of the church, as by law established, would not one and all contend for his being punished and silenced? There cannot be a doubt but they would, and the impostor made severely to feel the weight of the law. He might try to persuade the clergy and the people that he was an inspired man; that they were all in the dark, and he alone was commissioned to shed light upon them; but not one of the clergy would he get to believe him, unless it was some poor half-starved curate, who could lose nothing by the experiment. So it was with Wickliffe; he found greedy ignorant clerks to imbibe his notions in hopes of benefitting from the credulity of the people, and the duke of Lancaster was not averse to the improving his estate by the possessions of the church, which, however, he was not allowed to do; such robbery being reserved for the beastly Henry and his rapacious courtiers. The effect of Wickliffe's doctrines, nevertheless, were too apparent in the disturbances

they created, and the treasons they gave rise to, nor were the evil consequences ever entirely removed.

To give another specimen of the daring attempts of the disciples of Wickliffe, who, Fox says, felt himself called upon "gradually to unveil the truth to the eyes of men," Dr. Lingard relates, that while Richard II. was establishing his power in Ireland, he was suddenly recalled to his English dominions. The disciples of Wickliffe, under the denomination of Lollards, had seized the opportunity of his absence to commence a fierce attack upon the revenues and the discipline of the church. Not content with affixing libels against the clergy in the most public places in the capital, they had prepared an inflammatory petition, which was to be presented to the House of Commons. This instrument is a strange compound of fanaticism and folly. It complains, that ever since the church had been endowed with worldly possessions, faith, hope, and charity have been banished from England: that the English priesthood is a false priesthood, because sinners can neither impart nor receive the Holy Spirit; that the clergy profess a life of celibacy, but pamper themselves too much to observe it; that by accepting places under the government they become hermaphrodites, obliging themselves to serve both God and mammon: that they teach transubstantiation, which leads to idolatry; enjoin confession, which makes them supercilious; authorize war and criminal executions, which are contrary to the law of Christ, a law of mercy and love; and permit men to exercise the trades of the goldsmith and sword-cutler, which are unnecessary and pernicious under the dispensation of the gospel. The prelates, alarmed at the boldness of these fanatics, solicited the protection of the king; who at their prayer returned to London, and reprimanded the patrons of the Lollards with so much severity, that they did not venture to move the subject in parliament." By this extract the reader must be now convinced, that there was neither truth nor justice on the part of these disturbers of the public peace, but only faction and a lawless desire of abolishing the constituted authorities of the realm.

## BURNING OF THE WICKLIFFITES.

As this subject is one of the utmost importance, and but little understood by the great mass of the people of England, we have distinguished it by a head line, and intend to elucidate it with as much perspicuity as we are master of. But, first we will see what Fox has got to say. He writes:—“In the council of the Lateran, a decree was made with regard to heretics, which required all magistrates to extirpate them upon pain of forfeiture and deposition. The canons of this council being received in England, the prosecution of heretics became a part of the common law; and a writ (stiled *de heretico comburendo*) was issued under king Henry IV. for burning them upon their conviction; and it was enacted, that all who presumed to preach without the licence of the bishops, should be imprisoned, and be brought to trial within three months. If, upon conviction, they offer to abjure, and were not relapses, they were to be imprisoned and fined at pleasure; but if they refused to abjure, or were relapses, they were to be delivered up to the secular arm; and the magistrates were to burn them in some public place. About this time William Sautre, parish priest of St. Osith, in London, being condemned as a relapse, and degraded by Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, a writ was issued, wherein burning is called the common punishment, and referring to the customs of other nations. This was the first example of that sort in England. The clergy, alarmed lest the doctrines of Wickliffe should ultimately become established, used every exertion in their power to check them. In the reign of Richard II. the bishops had obtained a general license to imprison heretics, without being obliged to procure a special order from court, which, however, the house of commons caused to be revoked. But as the fear of imprisonment could not check the pretended evil dreaded by the bishops, Henry IV., whose particular object was to secure the affection of the clergy, earnestly recommended to the parliament the concerns of the church. How reluctant soever the house

of commons might be to prosecute the Lollards, the credit of the court, and the cabals of the clergy, at last obtained a most detestable act, for the burning of obstinate heretics; which bloody statute was not repealed till the year 1677. It was immediately after the passing of this statute that the ecclesiastical court condemned William Sautre above mentioned."

We always have contended, and still contend, that PERSECUTION is *not* a part and parcel of the system of Catholicism. The precepts and maxims of the Catholic church are founded on the purest principles of charity; nay, it is charity itself, which is an emanation from the Deity, and by the Deity was the Catholic church founded. We have here the acknowledgment of Fox that the execution of the priest, Sautre, "was the FIRST example of the sort in England." Now the Catholic church had been established in this island, reckoning from the landing of St. Austin, in 596, to the execution of Sautre, in 1399, *eight hundred and three years*, without one single instance of corporal coercion for matters of opinion, though difference of opinion had occasionally arisen, and in the case of Wickliffe we find to some height. That this man was treated with the utmost lenity is confessed by Fox, and we find him remaining unmolested in his rectory till the day of his death. From what *cause* then could spring this writ, stiled *de heretico comburendo*, of which so much has been said to bring odium on the Catholic religion, and so little understood by the Protestants of England? Fox alludes to the council of Lateran, a decree of which, he says, required all magistrates to extirpate heretics upon pain of forfeiture and deposition. This decree, admitting that there was such a one passed, was not of faith, and therefore binding on none without the consent of the temporal power; and at this council, which may be consistently called the parliament of Christendom, there were present, either in person or by their ambassadors, all the sovereigns of Europe, to give their consent to such decrees of discipline as might be deemed conducive to the morals of society and the tranquillity of their



states. The real version of the decree, according to Dr. Lingard, was this, that persons convicted of heresy "should be left to the *secular* power, to be dealt with according to the due form of law." Now what could be more correct than this? Every state has an undoubted right to provide for its own internal as well as external security, and should an individual imbibe a notion that he is commissioned by God to preach novelties tending to disturb the peace, and raise tumults and rebellions, why, in the name of common sense, are not laws to be passed to prevent such lawless doings, no matter whether committed under the garb of a *religious* or *political* reformer? Who will have the hardihood to answer us in the negative? The same was the conduct of the Wickliffites; they sought, under the cloak of religion, to revolutionize all ranks and property; and when they had thus declared their intentions, and made them manifest by their actions, then, and not till then, and with a view of self-preservation, not of personal cruelty and ambition, did the authorities take upon them to protect themselves and the people, by this statute *de heretico comburendo*. So long as the heresy of Wickliffe was confined to mere matter of opinion, the spiritual weapons only of the church were exerted to counteract the poison, and convince the ignorant of their error; but when the infected proceeded to lawless outrages and murders, surely it was time to use the arm of the civil sword to restrain them within due bounds. Nor can the measures thought necessary at that time to be adopted be justly termed persecution, seeing that they were enforced on none but the most obdurate miscreants of the day.

When such a disposition reigned among the ignorant and illiterate people, it is no wonder that the clergy should become alarmed, and use every means in their power to check the progress of the pernicious doctrines; nor were the laity less anxious to subdue the spirit of depredation that influenced the Lollards. Fox would fain have us believe that the house of commons reluctantly passed the act; Dr. Lingard, however, tells us a different sort of story. This able and

accurate writer states, that the commons were more zealous at that time in opposing the Lollards, than the nobility and the clergy. On this interesting point we shall give the learned historian's own words. "Encouraged by the royal invitation, and the disposition of the commons, the clergy presented a petition to the king in parliament; and an act was passed for the protection of the church, and the suppression of the new sect. The preamble sets forth, that divers unauthorized preachers go about teaching new doctrines and heretical opinions, making conventicles and confederacies, holding schools, writing books, misinforming the people, and daily committing enormities too horrible to be heard: and that the bishops are unable to repress these offences, because the offenders despise ecclesiastical censures, and when they are cited before their ordinaries, depart into another diocese: the statute therefore provides, as a remedy for these evils, that the bishop shall have power to arrest and confine persons defamed or vehemently suspected of such offences, till they make their canonical purgation; and, if they be convicted, to punish them with imprisonment, and a fine to the king. It then enacts that if any person so convicted shall refuse to abjure such preachings, doctrines, opinions, schools, and informations, or after abjuration shall be proved to have relapsed, then the sheriff of the county, or the mayor and bailiffs of the nearest borough shall, on requisition, be present at the pronunciation of the sentence, shall receive the person so condemned into custody, and shall cause him to be burnt on a high place before the people, that such punishment may strike terror into the minds of others."—*Rot. Parl.* iii. 466. *Wilk. Conc.* iii. 252.

"During this very parliament (whether before or after the passing of the act is uncertain) a petition was presented to the lords and commons by William Sautre, begging that he might be permitted to dispute before them on the subject of religion. Such a request excited considerable surprise: but the enthusiast aspired to the crown of martyrdom, and had the satisfaction to fall a victim to his own folly. He had

been rector of Lynn, in Norfolk, but about two years before had been convicted of heresy and deprived of his living. On his recantation he had been lately admitted a chaplain in St. Osith's, in London. The character of Sautre, and the nature of his request, induced the convocation to summon him before them: and six days were allowed him to prepare his answer. The articles objected to him were those of which he had been accused before the bishop of Norwich. With unparalleled effrontery he denied his former conviction and recantation; explained the other articles in an orthodox sense; but refused to give any satisfaction on the subject of the eucharist. The trial was adjourned from day to day; and the archbishop, notwithstanding the contempt and insolence of his answers, made a last effort to save him, by asking if he were content to stand on that question by the determination of the church. He answered that he was, provided the determination were agreeable to the will of God: an evasion which of course was rejected. The record of his former conviction and recantation were now produced from the registry of the bishop of Norwich; and on the eleventh day from his arraignment he was pronounced by the primate a relapsed heretic, was degraded from his orders, and delivered into the custody of the constable and mareschal of England. — (*Con.* iii. 255-260). About a week afterwards, Henry consulted the temporal lords sitting in parliament, and by their advice issued a precept to the mayor and sheriffs to execute the sentence of the law upon Sautre. The unhappy man, instead of being shut up in an asylum for lunatics, was burnt to death as a malefactor, in the presence of an immense multitude: and the commons, by their speaker, returned thanks to the king that, whereas 'by bad doctrine the faith of holy church was on the point of being overturned, to the destruction of the king and kingdom, he had made and ordained a just remedy to the destruction of such doctrine and the pursuers thereof.'

“This severity did not, however, subdue the boldness of the preachers. They declaimed with redoubled animosity

against the temporalities of the clergy, till the lay proprietors became alarmed for the security of their own possessions. In 1407 the subject attracted the notice of the house of lords; a petition was sent by them to the commons for their concurrence, and it was afterwards presented by the speaker to the king. It stated that the preachers excited the people to take away the possessions of the church, of which the clergy were as assuredly endowed as the temporal lords were of their inheritances; and that unless these evil purposes were speedily resisted, it was probable that in process of time they would also move the people to take away the possessions and inheritances of the temporal lords, and make them common to the open commotion of the people and the utter subversion of the realm. In consequence it was enacted that such persons, together with those who maintained that king Richard was still alive, and others who published false prophecies to delude the people, should be arrested and brought before the next parliament to receive such judgment as the king and peers, in their judicial authority, should pronounce."

From this authentic relation it is evident that persecution is no part or parcel of the Catholic church. No act of violence was offered, nor could be offered by the clergy as clergymen; they petitioned the king in parliament, as members of the state, not as ministers of the church, in consequence of their temporalities being endangered by lawless and erroneous pretensions. The power was granted to them by the civil supreme authorities of the land, and it will not, we apprehend, be disputed, that the representatives of the people, that is, the *real* representatives of the people, for such was then the case, had the right to grant and delegate the power of preserving the peace of the kingdom to whomsoever they pleased. How far it was consistent with sound policy and a due regard of religion is mere matter of opinion; the then parliament thought it wise, and in this they were probably right, for as some part of the crime was an error in judgment, and as the clergy were then the most learned class of men in the country, and the most able to decide on the case,

none could be so proper to act as they in matters requiring discriminate nicety. That they acted with every degree of forbearance, charity and mildness, is conspicuous in their conduct towards the unfortunate Sautre. This unhappy ecclesiastic was a bold, impudent enthusiast; a recanter, a prevaricator, and frontless liar. When rector of Lynn, he was convicted of heresy, and retracted. The infection of heresy necessarily deprived him of his living; for it would have been inconsistency itself to have continued a man as the instructor of others, who was himself under the influence of error. On renouncing that error, we find him appointed to another situation, which does not display a vindictive or persecuting spirit on the part of the clergy; nor do their conduct in putting off his condemnation from time to time evince a sanguinary feeling towards him. Finding him obstinate, they had nothing left to do but to pronounce what he evidently was, a relapsed heretic, that is, a man wilfully attached to erroneous opinions—opinions which he must know, and which he had acknowledged, to be heretical. Having done this, they delivered him over to the officers of the civil power, to do with him as the laws of the *state*, not of the church, authorized them. We agree with Dr. Lingard that it would perhaps have been better had Santre been confined in a madhouse, instead of being burnt; but the king and the commons thought otherwise; they thought it best that the wretched man should be made a sacrifice to deter others from the like offence, and he suffered accordingly. Why such an outcry should be raised by the admirers of Fox's lies against this single statute by Henry IV., while so many bloody laws were passed against Catholics by Elizabeth and her successors, for no other cause than their adherence to truth and rejection of error, is somewhat incomprehensible. It must arise from the most stupid ignorance, or the basest impudence, and when they have made their choice, there is plenty of cause to make them blush. During the whole space when Catholicism was in power, from the time of passing the act to the assumption of the spiritual



supremacy by Henry VIII, embracing a period of more than 130 years, fewer persons suffered under the writ *de heretico comburendo* than in the last fifteen years of the first *spiritual* temporal head of the church of England. But it is time to see what kind of martyrs Fox has selected to grace his martyrology and stamp credit on Wickliffe's doctrines.

#### MARTYRDOM OF THOMAS BADBY.

The first after Sawtree, named by the modern editors, is an inspired *tailor* of the above name, and is distinguished by the above title line. Fox writes,—“Thomas Badby was a layman, and by trade a tailor. He was arraigned in the year 1409 before the bishop of Worcester, and convicted of heresy. On his examination he said, that it was impossible any priest could make the body of Christ sacramentally, nor would he believe it, unless he saw, manifestly, the corporal body of the Lord to be handled by the priest at the altar; that it was ridiculous to imagine that, at the supper, Christ held in his own hand his own body, and divided it among his disciples, and yet remained whole. ‘I believe,’ said he, ‘the omnipotent God in Trinity; but if every consecrated host at the altars be Christ’s body, there must then be in England no less than 20,000 gods.’ After this, he was brought before the archbishop of Canterbury, at St. Paul’s church, and again examined in presence of a great number of bishops, the duke of York, and several of the first nobility. Great pains were used to make him recant; but he courageously answered, that he would still abide by his former opinions, which no power should force him to forego. On this the archbishop of Canterbury ratified the sentence given by the bishop of Worcester. When the king had signed the warrant for his death, he was brought to Smithfield, and there being put in an empty tun, was bound with iron chains fastened to a stake, and had dry wood piled around him. And as he was thus standing in the tub, it happened the prince of Wales, the king’s eldest son, was there present; who, being moved with compassion, endeavoured to save the life of him whom

the hypocritical Levites and Pharisees sought to put to death. He admonished and counselled him that, having respect unto himself, he should speedily withdraw himself out of these dangerous labyrinths of opinions, adding oftentimes threatenings, which might have daunted any man not supported by the true faith. Also Courtney, at that time chancellor of Oxford, preached unto him, and informed him of the faith of holy church. In the mean time, the prior of St. Bartholomew's, in Smithfield, brought, with all solemnity, the sacrament of God's body, with twelve torches borne before, and shewed the sacrament to the poor man at the stake. And then they demanded of him how he believed in it, he answered that he knew well it was hallowed bread, and not God's body. And then was the tun put over him, and fire put unto him. And when he felt the fire he cried, 'Mercy!' (calling upon the Lord), when the prince immediately commanded to take away the tun, and quench the fire. He then asked him if he would forsake heresy, and take the faith of holy church, which, if he would do, he should have goods enough, promising him also a yearly pension out of the king's treasury. But this valiant champion of Christ, neglecting the prince's fair words, as also contemning all men's devices, refused the offer of worldly promises, being more inflamed by the spirit of God, than by any earthly desire. Wherefore, as he continued immovable in his former mind, the prince commanded him straight to be put again into the tun, and that he should not afterwards look for any grace or favour. But as he could be allured by no rewards, he was not at all abashed at their torments, but, as a valiant soldier of Christ, persevered invincibly till his body was reduced to ashes, and his soul rose triumphant unto him who gave it."

To this rodомontade account them odern editors have added the following note: "It will not be uninteresting to our town readers, to be informed, that that part of Smithfield where the large board containing the laws and regulations of the market formerly stood, is the very spot on which their forefathers suffered for the cause of Christ. There many an

English martyr's body mingled with the dust ; from thence ascended many a soul to inherit everlasting glory." So far as the Wickliffites were concerned, we shall shew that the cause for which they suffered was not that of Christ nor of Christianity, and the reader must be informed that Catholic martyrs suffered in Smithfield under the beastly Henry, who was the founder of that devastating thing, called the Reformation, in greater numbers than the fanatical disciples of the Reformation so called. We agree with the author of the note that many an English martyr's body there mingled with the dust, and that many a soul ascended from thence to everlasting glory ; but then they were martyrs to the cause of truth, and not the enthusiast victims of visionary theories.

But what shall we say to this learned tailor of the fifteenth century, whose knowledge of divinity is here stated to have been so great as to bear down all the clergy with the king and the duke of York to boot ? Why this reverend knight of the thimble must have excelled the famous tailor of Leyden, who, though he assumed the title of king of Sion, does not appear to have been a cool disputant with divines, whose lives had been spent in studying the fathers and exploring sacred history. But where did Fox, or his editors, find this narrative of the life, behaviour, and death of this " valiant champion of Christ," Tom Badby, layman and tailor ? We have looked into Stowe, Baker, Rapin, Echard, and Lingard, but we can find no trace, in their pages, of any such transaction. Nay, we have by us an edition of Fox, by a Rev. Henry Southwell, LL.D., who does not mention our learned tailor. It is true there is a History of England, by one Russell, a work scarcely heard of, in which it is stated, that, in the year 1410, " One Bodby, a tailor, took upon him to exclaim violently against the absurdity of the real presence in the sacrament. This person, therefore, was singled out by the clergy for exemplary punishment. He was accordingly tried and condemned to the stake, and the prince of Wales had the curiosity to be a spectator of the execution. When the flames first reached the body of the criminal, he cried out in so horrid a manner,

that the prince ordered the fire to be removed, and offered the man his life, together with a pension out of his private purse, as the flames had disabled him from following his business, on condition he would renounce his opinions. Bodby, however, shocked when he first felt the flames, refused the offered pardon ; he loved his opinions better than his life ; and he was accordingly committed again to the fire, and there resigned his breath as a forfeit to his faith." For this account there is not the least voucher, and we may therefore conclude that, as the most authentic writers are silent on the subject, the story is a fictitious one.

That some of the circumstances connected with the tale are spurious and self-made, we think, probable. Can it be supposed, for one moment, by any rational mind, that so much interest should be shown towards an individual in so humble a station of life, by the king and the principal nobility, as well as the dignified clergy, as to honour him with a public examination in St. Paul's church ? Then again, why is the *duke of York* introduced ? Who was the duke of York of that day ? Not a son of the king, reader, but one among the rest of the nobles, of no great eminence for talent or ability, that we read of. The whole story, the more it is examined, the more improbable it appears. The tailor is first arraigned before the bishop of Worcester, and convicted of heresy ; then he is brought before the archbishop of Canterbury, and examined in the presence of the king and nobility, in St. Paul's church, when the sentence is ratified by the primate, and the warrant for his death signed by the king. Truly, the tailor is a most important personage, that the ordinary process of the law was not sufficient to convict him, but the most extraordinary proceedings must be entered into to overcome his novelties and vagaries. Firm as the tailor was before the prelates and the monarch, when the fire began to warm him, we are told, his heart failed him and he cried out for mercy ! A precious witness for the truth of the gospel, to be sure ! How different from the conduct of the primitive martyrs, and the Catholic sufferers under Protestant

ascendancy. These latter braved their torments, and scorned to cry for mercy from their persecutors. They gave testimony of the truth, by the invincible fortitude of their behaviour, nor did they rest their faith on their own fanciful reason, but learned it from the apostles and their successors.

The tailor, it is said, denied that any priest could make the body of Christ sacramentally, and "that it was ridiculous to imagine that, at the supper, Christ held in his own hand his own body, and divided it among his disciples, and yet remained whole." Ridiculous as Tom Badby might suppose such doctrine to be, the learned fathers of the Catholic church, who derived their faith from the apostles themselves, who were present at this very supper, believed differently from John Fox's tailor. Their sentiments may be seen in the first volume of this work ; and we beg the reader will refer to them before he proceeds any further, and compare them with the ridiculous nonsense put into Badby's mouth. The mode of execution, as described by Fox, is ludicrous in the extreme, invented probably to please the taste of ignorant people, who delight in the marvellous, or borrowed from the tub-preachers of some sectarians. At that time, it was usual, we believe, to hang first and burn afterwards. At least, such was the way in which Sir John Oldecastle suffered.

One word more, and we close with the tailor. From what is stated to have passed between the prince and Badby, it cannot be said that he was persecuted. Every mode of persuasion, it seems, was used to overcome the fellow's obstinacy. He was promised goods and a pension by the prince, if he would but believe as all the world then believed; but, as soon as he lost the pain of the fire, he became *inspired*, and renounced the "offer of worldly promises, being more inflamed by the spirit of God than by any earthly desires." What cant and hypocrisy, to insinuate that a tailor, who must of necessity have been ignorant in the extreme, so far as literary knowledge was concerned, the use of letters being then chiefly confined to the clergy, and printing not invented; what hypocrisy, we say, what cant to represent this man as



*inspired* of God, and the holder of the true faith, in opposition to the belief of the whole nation for upwards of eight hundred years. Really, such rant is truly disgusting, and fit only for bedlamites.

The modern editors of Fox have been rather concise respecting the persecutions, as they are called, of the Wickliffites or Lollards, as they have confined themselves to two cases only, namely, this tailor Badby and Sir John Oldecastle, of whom we shall speak hereafter. Other editors of this martyrology, as well as Fox himself, however, have been more prolix, and the historians of England, with a single exception or so, have grossly misrepresented the conduct of the clergy and the then constituted authorities, in their proceedings to stem the torrent of sedition and rebellion rushing throughout the kingdom, and threatening destruction to civil society from the pernicious tendency of Wickliffe's doctrines. These writers have studiously represented the question as one of religion, and the only opposition shewn as raised against the supposed enroachments and corruptions of the church of Rome. This, however, was not the case, as we shall proceed to shew, by a few instances, it is our intention to cite from a work issued by Protestant hands, and therefore the less exceptionable to the generality of the people. In doing this, we are influenced by a desire to disabuse the public mind, which has been so long led astray by interested writers, and is so little informed on those points of history which it is so important they should know, to be able to distinguish the truth. On no subject are the people of England less informed than that of sacred history, and of profane, too, where the interests of the Catholic church are concerned. The measures judged prudent and precautionary by our ministers and legislature, in these days of Protestant enlightenment, to preserve order and regularity in the state, are represented as sanguinary and persecuting, the offspring of a bloodthirsty religion, and the invention of cruel churchmen in the days of Catholic darkness, though precisely of the same nature, and adopted for the same ends. The law of *de heretico comburendo*,

though directed against heresy, was occasioned by the SEDITIOUS and TRAITOROUS tendency of those who imbibed the erroneous opinions, and, though those who suffered might have been convicted of heresy, yet it must also be observed that they were guilty of TREASON and SEDITION, and suffered hanging for the latter crimes. This we shall proceed to prove be the following example, which we have selected from a work we have before quoted, namely, *The History of King-killers; or, The Fanatic Martyrology*, published in the year 1720. The facts recorded therein are authenticated, and are stated to have been derived from another work written by a church of England divine, the Rev. Mr. Earbery, and entitled, *The pretended Reformers; or, The History of John Wickliffe, &c.* We beg the reader's serious attention to the statements made, and likewise to the remarks which the author makes on Fox, for introducing such desperate villians and barefaced hypocrites into his famous, or rather infamous, Book of Martyrs.

WILLIAM CLAYDON.

“This fellow was a currier by trade; but running mad with an enthusiastic spirit communicated to him by the followers of that known rebel, Sir John Oldecastle, he quitted his lawful profession to bear arms against his sovereign, king Henry V., in the year 1413. In relation to this man, the best account we find is in Walsingham, who, speaking of Oldecastle, says thus: ‘In the mean time, their leader and chief, Sir John Oldecastle, coming abroad, sent a messenger to the lord Abergavenny, that he would be revenged of him for the injuries received; but he wisely prevented him, and, departing from his castle at midnight, got so many men about him, that Sir John was obliged to fly again to his retreat; however, the lord Abergavenny took a priest of his, who confessed where his arms, banners, &c., lay; and soon after was taken an old Lollard of the same gang, called William Claydon, who, depending on the notions of his sect, was become so mad, that, being himself a layman, he pretended to confer holy orders on his son, and to make him a priest, and to celebrate

mass in his house on the day of his mother's rising from childbed, for which, he being apprehended, examined and legally convicted, he was burnt in London. The reader is here to observe, that though this wretch was burnt as a heretic, he was taken in open rebellion, and must have died for the same if the crime of heresy, being a rebellion against God, had not taken place.' It is true Fox sets him down as a martyr, and on the same day, which does not in the least exempt him from this calendar, because nothing is more plain than that he was a rebel, and, indeed, Fox has been very free in canonizing any such if they came in his way, as is visible by a very considerable number of his martyrs, whom all historians acknowledge to have been traitors. As for the wild notions of this fanatic, more of them may be seen where we treat of others of his gang; and I believe any member of the church of England will be convinced of the brutality of this fellow, when he finds him taken in open rebellion, and practising an episcopal power, being himself an illiterate, graceless, and base currier."

#### WILLIAM MURLE.

"Thomas Walsingham, the author above quoted in the life of William Claydon, gives us the following short account of this William Murle, who was one of the same wicked gang with Claydon, last spoken of. 'This Murle, more closely following the opinions of John Oldcastle, had perfidiously been more vexatious to many of the orthodox than any other of his sect. And this fellow having been in St. Giles's Fields, and understanding that the king was coming thither, he withdrew into the country for fear, and hid himself there. He had before made preparations for receiving the order of knighthood at the hands of Sir John Oldcastle, to which purpose he had brought with him two fine horses, with rich furniture, adorned with gold, and a pair of gilt spurs in his bosom, for the same effect the which were found upon him when taken, soon after his flight from the field. Being dragged from his lurking place, he was hanged, drawn, and

burnt ; an end which he well deserved. Among other things there was found upon him a list of the names of monks, which he had taken from the chanter of St. Alban's, and those monks he intended to have destroyed, in order to obtain, by the gift and donation of the aforesaid John Oldcastle, the place and possessions of the monks of St. Alban's. Many others, as well priests as laymen, were taken, convicted, and condemned for this conspiracy, and had like ends ; most of whom died impenitent.' Thus Walsingham.

"This Murle was a malster, of Dunstable, and having by that trade acquired wealth, the same turned his brain, so as to entertain thoughts of being a knight, and enjoying all the large possessions of the abbey of St. Albans, and all this by joining in rebellion with Sir John Oldcastle. The devil had blinded him, and being purse-proud, there was nothing so lenious but what he could attempt to raise himself above his mean state, and accordingly he was advanced to the gallows, the fittest preferment for such scoundrels. His life and death was at the same time with William Claydon, the next above him."

#### SIR ROGER ACTON.

"The heresy of Wickliffe, for such Mr. Earbery has sufficiently proved it to be, having spread itself in England, under the protection of the duke of Lancaster, who favoured the same in order to exclude his elder brother's son from the succession to the crown, and to usurp the same himself, it occasioned, as the same author informs us, many seditions, murders, and rebellions, which we have not here room to mention. The same spirit, says Mr. Earbery, which began Wickliffe's reformation, animated his followers after his death, to rebel under Sir John Oldcastle in England, &c. Sir Roger Acton was one deeply engaged in that rebellion.

"In the reign of king Henry V., and in the year 1413, the Wickliffian heretics posted it up in writing on the church doors in London, that there were an hundred thousand of them ready to rise up in arms against such as opposed their

sect. One Sir John Oldecastle, called lord Cobham, for having married a kinswoman of that nobleman, was their chief, having been before convicted of heresy, and made his escape out of custody. This Sir Roger Acton of whom we here speak, was engaged with Oldecastle, and next to him in post. Their design was to murder the king and his brothers, and to destroy all the religious houses in London. The king having sufficient information of these practices, and that the rendezvous of the rebels was appointed to be in the wood at St. Giles's, came privately away from Eltham, where he had kept Christmas, to Westminster, on the day after the feast of the Epiphany, and having ordered the lord mayor to keep the city gates shut, that the rebels in the city might not join those in the wood, went himself to the said wood after midnight with a considerable body of men, where he took above eighty men of that gang in armour, who being thus surprized, and not knowing by whom, all owned that they came to the lord Cobham. He and the rest, being thus disappointed, fled; but in the pursuit several of his men were killed or taken, of the latter, sixty-nine were convicted as TRAITORS at Westminster, of which number thirty-seven were on the 13th of January, drawn from the Tower of London to Newgate, and so to St. Giles's, and there all hanged in a place called Ficket's field; seven of them were also burnt with the gallows on which they hung. Some time after Sir Roger Acton, having skulked about and lain concealed among his party, was discovered and taken, and the fact being so notorious, that there was no difficulty to convict him; so that on the 10th of February he was hanged and drawn, and buried under the gallows. Though Fox, in his Martyrology, has given these and many others for martyrs, having found them no other than rebels, by the universal consent of all our historians, there is no reason why they should not have their due place here among the fanatic martyrs and king-killers, for to murder the king was their intention, and to involve the nation in blood and rapine under a false pretext of religion, the cloak for all rebellions. Walsingham and other ancient



historians do inform us, that this Sir Roger Acton was a very lewd fellow, reduced to beggary by his riotousness, and thus sought to recover himself by the spoil of his country."

WILLIAM MANDEVILLE AND RICHARD RUSSEL.

"The heresy of Wickliffe having spread abroad in several parts of England, and disposing the people to libertinism and rebellion, there were many executed at several times for the same. William Murle is one instance hereof on the fourth of February, and we shall hereafter speak of others in their proper places. The two saints we here treat of were of that gang, rank enthusiasts, and infatuated with the poison of those abominable doctrines. Being both obscure fellows, and their reign in villainy but short, we have only the following brief account of them in Stow. 'Soon after Easter, in the year 1414, being the 10th of king Henry the VIth, who was still in his minority, the lord protector was warned of an assembly of certain lewd persons, under pretence of religious minded men, to be assembled at Abington, wherefore he sent thither certain persons, and also rode thither himself, and there arrested the baily of the town, named William Mandeville, a weaver, the which was appointed for a captain, who had named himself Jack Sharp of Wigmer's Land, in Wales, who being examined, confessed that he meant to have done many mischiefs, especially against priests, so that he would have made their heads as cheap as sheep's heads, that is to say, three or four a penny, or as some write, ten for a penny. Many of his accomplices were taken and sent to divers prisons. Their captain, Mandeville, was drawn, hanged and beheaded at Abington, and his head was sent to London, and set on the bridge; his other fautors were executed in divers places and countries, to the terror of others.'

"I here join to this scoundrel another like him, though he belongs to another day, because he is too inconsiderable to deserve a place to himself. Stow, in the same place above quoted, goes on thus: 'Also the 13th of July, Richard Russel, woolman, was hanged, drawn and quartered, for that

he would have made dukes and earls at his pleasure. Here we see the nature of wicked sectaries, who are wholly bent upon cruelty; Mandeville was for murdering of all clergy, which was the meaning of making their heads so cheap, and Russel could design no less than the destruction of the ancient nobility, to make room for his rabble of dukes and earls, and both could aim at no less than the slaughter of their sovereign, usurping such barbarous authority themselves."

ELEANOR COBHAM, DUCHESS OF GLOUCESTER.

"She was the daughter of Reginald Cobham, lord of Stirbrough, and wife to Humphrey, duke of Gloucester. Having been infected with the fanatic notions of John Wickliffe, she abandoned herself to all sorts of wickedness, and associated with infamous persons. Among these were Roger Bolingbroke, an astrologer, and Thomas Southwell, canon of St. Stephen's chapel at Westminster, both of them reputed necromancers; as also Margery Gurdemaine, commonly called the witch of Eye, by whose sorceries it was then thought that lady Eleanor had induced the duke of Gloucester to love and marry her: all these persons conspired to destroy king Henry VI. by sorcery or witchcraft, and Roger Bolingbroke and Thomas Southwell being apprehended and examined, both of them confessed their guilt, and declared that what they had done, had been at the instigation of the said duchess. For this, Roger Bolingbroke did public penance on a scaffold, in St. Paul's churchyard. On the Tuesday following, the duchess knowing herself guilty, fled by night into the sanctuary at Westminster. Being cited, upon the information of the parties aforesaid, to appear before Henry Chicheley, archbishop of Canterbury, Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, and cardinal John Kemp, archbishop of York, and cardinal William Aiscoth, bishop of Salisbury &c., in St. Stephen's chapel, at Westminster, to answer to twenty-eight articles of necromancy, witchcraft, sorcery, heresy and treason, she appeared accordingly, and Roger Bolingbroke charging her with having employed him in those

mischiefs, she was on the 11th of August committed to the custody of Sir John Stewart, Sir William Rolfe, John Stanley, Esq., and others, to be conveyed to the castle of Leeds, there to remain till three weeks after Michaelmas. Not long after she was indicted of high treason, in Guildhall, in London, before the earls of Huntingdon, Stafford, Suffolk, and Northumberland, the treasurer, Sir Ralph Cromwell, John Cornwall, lord Fanhope, Sir Walter Hungerford, and some judges of both benches. On the 21st of October she appeared in the chapel of St. Stephen, at Westminster, again, before Robert Gilbert, bishop of London, William Alnewick, of Lincoln, and Thomas Brown, of Norwich, where Adam Molins, clerk of the king's council, read the articles of sorcery and witchcraft laid to her charge, whereof some she denied, and others she confessed. On the 23rd of October she appeared again, and the witnesses against her being examined, she was fully convicted. Being then asked whether she had anything to object against the witnesses, she answered in the negative, and submitted herself. On the 27th of October she abjured the articles, and was ordered to appear again on the 9th of November, which she accordingly did, before the archbishop and others, and was enjoined penance, which she performed as follows :—

“ On Monday, the 13th of November, she went from Westminster by water, and landed at the Temple bridge, whence she proceeded through Fleet-street, with a wax candle of two pounds in her hand, without an hood, but with a kerchief, to St. Paul's, where she offered her taper at the high altar. On the Wednesday following, she landed at the Swan in Thames-street, and went through Bridge-street, Gracechurch-street, &c., straight to Leaden-hall, and so to Christchurch, by Aldgate. On Friday she landed at Queenhithe, and proceeded to Cheapside, to St. Michael's in Cornhill, in the same manner as aforesaid. At all these times the mayor, sheriffs, and tradesmen of London met and accompanied her. After all this she was committed to the custody of Sir Thomas Stanley, so to remain during her life in the

castle of Chester, having 100 marks a year allowed for her maintenance; but in the 22nd year of king Henry the VI., she was removed to Kenilworth. Her pride, covetousness, and lust, were the cause of her confusion.

“This is one, as well as some others before mentioned, whom Fox has thought fit to canonize as a saint in his Book of Martyrs, and indeed we have here shown that she was a king-killer in intention, though she could not compass her design, and being a practitioner in sorcery and witchcraft, she may well have a place among fanatic saints, such as many are of those transmitted to us by that latitudinarian writer. It is true there are many at this time who altogether explode all notions of sorcery or witchcraft, it is not our business to enter upon this controversy, but all the persons here mentioned having confessed their guilt in that crime, it must be supposed that they best knew what they had done, and whether they had really any compact with the devil or not, their confession sufficiently evinces, that they practised such things as they looked upon as charms, and that the end of the same was to destroy the king, which is enough to prove they were intentional regicides, and so far answers our purpose.”

#### MARTYRDOM OF SIR JOHN OLDCASTLE.

We come to another of John Fox's martyrs, of whom more has been said by historians than of the Tom Badby, and we shall therefore be better able to detect the falsehoods and misrepresentations of the martyrologist. But first let us have his account of the affair. “The persecutions of the Lollards,” he says, “in the reign of Henry V. were owing to the cruel instigations of the clergy, who thought the most effectual way to check the progress of Wickliffe's doctrines, would be to attack the then chief protector of it, viz., Sir John Oldecastle, baron of Cobham; and to persuade the king that the Lollards were engaged in conspiracies to overturn the state. It was even reported that they intended to murder the king, together with the princes, his brothers, and

most of the lords spiritual and temporal, in hopes that the confusion which must necessarily arise in the kingdom, after such a massacre, would prove favourable to their religion. Upon this a false rumour was spread that Sir John Oldcastle had got together 20,000 men in St. Giles's in the Fields, a place then overgrown with bushes. The king himself went thither at midnight, and finding no more than fourscore or a hundred persons, who were privately met upon a religious account, he fell upon them and killed many. Some of them being afterwards examined, were prevailed upon, by promises or threats, to confess whatever their enemies desired; and these accused Sir John Oldcastle.

"The king hereupon thought him guilty; and in that belief set a thousand marks upon his head, with a promise of perpetual exemption from taxes to any town which should secure him. Sir John was apprehended and imprisoned in the Tower; but escaping from thence, he fled into Wales, where he long concealed himself. But being afterwards seized in Powis land, in North Wales, by Lord Powis, he was brought to London, to the great joy of the clergy, who were highly incensed against him, and resolved to sacrifice him, to strike a terror into the rest of the Lollards. Sir John was of a very good family, had been sheriff of Hertfordshire under Henry IV., and summoned to parliament among the barons of the realm in that reign. He had been sent beyond the sea, with the earl of Arundel, to assist the duke of Burgundy against the French. In a word, he was a man of extraordinary merit, notwithstanding which he was condemned to be hanged up by the waist, with a chain, and burned alive. This most barbarous sentence was executed, amidst the curses and imprecations of the priests and monks, who used their utmost endeavours to prevent the people from praying for him. Such was the tragical end of Sir John Oldcastle, who left the world with a resolution and constancy that answered perfectly to the brave spirit with which he had ever maintained the cause of truth and of his God.

"Not satisfied with his single death, the clergy induced



the parliament to make fresh statutes against the Lollards. It was enacted, among other things, that whosoever read the scriptures in English should forfeit land, chattels, goods, and life, and be condemned as heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and traitors to the kingdom; that they should not have the benefit of any sanctuary; and that, if they continued obstinate, or relapsed after being pardoned, they should first be hanged for treason against the king, and then burned for heresy against God. This act was no sooner passed, but a violent persecution was raised against the Lollards; several of them were burnt alive, some fled the kingdom, and others were weak enough to abjure their religion, to escape the torments prepared for them."

Such is the account given by Fox, or his modern editors; the reader, by a comparison with the foregoing accounts of some of Oldcastle's comrades, will be able to appreciate the credit due to the relation of the martyrologist. As usual, all is bare assertion; not a voucher has he produced to prove the authenticity of the incidents he mentions, but we are called upon to take for granted whatever he has thought proper to advance. The time, however, is come when facts must be produced to obtain credit, and it would have been well for the people of England had they always demanded unquestionable authority for the statements of historians. With Catholic writers it has been the invariable rule to lay down the source from whence any extraordinary circumstance has been derived, in order that the suspecting party might satisfy themselves by a reference to the authority cited; while, on the other hand, the oppugners of truth always shun plain and open dealing, and have recourse to trick and deception to make up what may be wanted of common honesty. Such is the case with Fox in his account of the death of Sir John Oldcastle. He commences his tale by attributing the persecutions of the Lollards, in Henry V.'s time, "to the cruel instigations of the clergy, who," he says, "thought that the most effectual way to *check* the progress of Wickliffe's doctrines, would be to attack the then *chief protector* of them," this Sir John Old-

castle, and "to *persuade* the king that the Lollards were engaged in conspiracies to overturn the state." We trust the people of England will no longer be *persuaded* by Fox and "the few plain Christians," his modern editors, to take these gross perversions of history for genuine fact. Let us refer to dates, which are the best guides to come at disputed facts. Wickliffe's doctrines had been broached about fifty years when Sir John Oldcastle was apprehended. Several rebellions had been occasioned by their dissemination, during the reign of Henry's father, and his predecessor, Richard II., so that there could be no occasion for the clergy to *persuade* the king that conspiracies were *intended*, when he had himself the perfect knowledge that such had *actually* been entered into to dethrone his father, and were in progress to wrest the sceptre from himself. To charge the clergy, therefore, with being the instruments of *persecuting* a nest of traitors and plunderers, because these treason-hatchers had the adroitness to screen their lawless and wicked designs under a pretence of reforming *religion*, and purifying the morals of the clergy, is brazen impudence and mendacity in the extreme.

Henry, when prince of Wales, had joined the lords and commons in petitioning his father to arrest the progress of the preachers and punish them, as may be seen by searching the records of parliament. This fact is an indisputable proof of the lying qualities of Fox. Sir John Oldcastle had been one of the intimate companions of Henry in the follies of his youth, and on the reformation of the monarch, on his coming to the crown, he was dismissed his presence, in consequence of the opinions he held and the immorality of his conduct. Henry therefore did not require the instigation of the clergy. Fuller (p. 168) tells that Sir John Oldcastle was, among our more ancient dramatists, the debauched but facetious knight who now treads the stage under the name of Sir John Falstaff. Thus we have the same personage pourtrayed by Fox as a "godly martyr," and by Shakspeare as a "beastly debauchè." What an edifying saint to grace the martyrology

of John Fox. To return, however, to the narrative. Fox says, the persons who were assembled in St. Giles's, and surprised by the king, "were *privately* met upon a RELIGIOUS account," and that "he fell upon them and killed many." In contradiction to this gross falsehood, we refer the reader to the account of the death of Sir Roger Acton, page 89, which is copied from Stow. Of the extraordinary merit of this notorious traitor we have before given an account; his death, which is represented to have been most tragical, was no other than what many others less deserving have undergone, without exciting the notice or pity of John Fox. The execution of this base villian took place when the king was engaged with his army in France, and is thus related by Dr. Lingard:—"But while the king was thus occupied with the conquest in Normandy, a feeble attempt had been made to deprive him of England. In consequence of a secret understanding between the Scottish cabinet and the chiefs of the Lollards, the Duke of Albany and the Earl Douglass suddenly crossed the borders and laid siege, the former to the castle of Berwick, the latter to that of Roxburgh. It proved, however, a 'foul raid.' They had persuaded themselves that the kingdom had been left without a competent force for its protection: but when they learned that the Dukes of Bedford and Exeter were approaching at the head of one hundred thousand men, they decamped with precipitation, and disbanded their armies. At the same time Sir John Oldecastle emerged from his concealment, and arrived in the neighbourhood of London. The retreat of the Scots defeated all his projects. At St. Albans he eluded, by a precipitate flight, the pursuit of his enemies: in the marches of Wales he was taken, after an obstinate resistance, by Sir Edward Charlton, a retainer of the lord Powis. At the petition of the commons (the parliament was then sitting) he was arraigned before the peers: the indictment on which he had been formerly outlawed, was read, and he was asked in the usual form by the Duke of Bedford, why he should not receive sentence of death. Instead of replying directly to the ques-

tion, he preached a long sermon on one of the favourite doctrines of his sect, that it is the duty of man to forgive, and to leave the punishment of offences in the hands of the Almighty. Being interrupted, and required to return a direct answer, he said that he would never acknowledge the authority of that court, as long as his liege lord, king Richard II., was alive in Scotland. Judgment was instantly pronounced ; that he should be hanged as a traitor, and burnt as a heretic. St. Giles's fields, which had been the theatre of his rebellion, witnessed also his punishment. By his partisans he would have been revered as a martyr, had not their faith been staggered and scandalized by a non-accomplishment of a prophecy, which he was said to have uttered at the gallows, that he should rise again from the grave on the third day."

Looking at this account by Dr. Lingard, and that given by Fox, the shameless mendacity of the latter is most conspicuous, and must make the unprejudiced Protestant blush at the depravity of the mind that could deliberately and purposely invent such brazen lies to villify the clergy of former times, who were the fathers of the people and the protectors of the poor. Alas ! how have the people of England been deceived and beguiled, since the pretended Reformation, by the means of the press. From the moment the spiritual supremacy was connected with the state, the press became the instrument of forgery, falsehood, misrepresentation, calumny, and fanaticism. By a long career of near three hundred years in this wholesale system of iniquity, the people of this country have been plunged into the densest mists of error and imposition. Thus the most palpable lies have been swallowed as indisputable facts ; the most depraved villians have been taken for the most pious saints ; and the most humane and self-devoted order of religious men for the most sanguinary and malignant miscreants. The time, however, is rapidly approaching when the rays of truth will dispel this dark gloom, and exhibit the hypocrites and falsifiers in all their horrid deformity. In this relation of the

death of Sir John Oldcastle, Fox, with his usual malice and want of veracity, has represented the Catholic priests and monks as the bitterest enemies of the hoary traitor, though it is clearly proved by Dr. Lingard and other authorities, that he was arraigned at the petition of the representatives of the people, and that he confessed himself a traitor to the reigning king. Fox also states that he was hung "by the *waist* with a chain, and *burnt alive*." This statement, made for the purpose of exciting horror and indignation against the supposed cruelty and barbarity of our Catholic ancestors, is positively contradicted by Stow, who had better means of ascertaining the fact than Fox. The former says, "he (Sir John Oldcastle) was hanged by the *neck* in a chain of iron, and AFTER consumed with fire." Who, after this palpable detection, can believe the statements in this *Book of Martyrs*? Fox talks of Oldcastle's "resolution and constancy," and his "*brave spirit*," but he does not note his *fanatical* spirit, which led him to predict his resurrection from death after the third day, which is recorded by Stow, and as Dr. Lingard observes, staggered not a few of his deluded disciples on finding his prophecy not fulfilled.

Fox next asserts that, "not satisfied with his (Oldcastle's) *single* death, the *clergy* induced the parliament to make fresh statutes against the Lollards." In *whose* reign, and in *what* year, were these *fresh* statutes made? It was surely an easy task to have given chapter and verse, by a reference to history and the statute book. He talks here of the *single* death of Oldcastle, after having recorded the martyrdoms, as he calls the death of Sautre and Badby, and recounting the killings of many of Oldcastle's followers, as persecutions by the clergy. We have, from authentic testimony, named several traitors that suffered death for their crimes, and were classed as martyrs by Fox; how then can he here speak of only *one* single death, namely, Oldcastle's? The insinuation is base and groundless, and like the rest of the assertions made by this lying martyrologist. For instance, he says, "it was enacted, among other things, that whosoever *read*



the scriptures in English, should forfeit land, chattels, goods, and life; and be condemned as *heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and traitors to the kingdom.*" Were ever such improbabilities before put forth for facts? People in general, at that time, were not able to read; but why not punish the *translators* and *copyists*, as well as the *readers*? If it was made *heresy* and *treason* merely to *read*, what ought to have been the crime and punishment of those who were the instigators of this heresy and treason? But who ever heard of the mere *readers* of the scriptures becoming heretics, and heretics to God too? What nonsense, sheer stupid nonsense, is this. HERESY, as defined by Johnson, is "an opinion of private men, different from that of the Catholic and orthodox church;" and a HERETIC, "one who *propagates* his *private* opinions in opposition to the Catholic church." Now a man might *read* the scripture, as hundreds and thousands have read the sacred volume, and yet remain Catholics—sound orthodox Catholics; therefore to make it heresy and treason merely to read the bible is preposterous folly, and such as our Catholic ancestors, though they are said to have lived in the dark ages, would never have been guilty of. No, no; it was not the *reading* then, nor is it the *reading* now, of the scriptures, that the Catholic church objects to; it is the *misinterpretation* of the sacred text that she condemns; and it was the corruption of the meaning to traitorous purposes that caused our ancestors to pass the law *de heretico comburendo*, as we have shewn by indisputable facts, accompanied by the clearest testimony.

This account of the death of Oldcastle is self-contradictory in the extreme. Fox says that Oldcastle was burned alive, and in the same column he says the punishment of the Lollards was, to be hung *first*, for treason against the king, and *then* burned for heresy against God. Again, he says, there were *fresh statutes* made against the Lollards, and immediately after he speaks of only *one*. "*This act*," he writes, was no sooner passed, but a violent persecution was raised against the Lollards; several of them were burnt

*alive,*" &c. Yet this very law, by his own statement, enacted that they should be hung in the first instance, and burned afterwards. Verily those who believe such a narrator as Fox will believe any thing, however incredible or monstrous.

#### CONFESSION OF SIR JOHN OLDCASTLE.

Fox next proceeds to give an account of the religious creed of this infamous and debauched knight, Oldcastle. He says, "The following is the confession of this *virtuous* and *true* Christian, which, from its *clearness* and *simplicity*, is well worthy of remembrance." He commences with the Apostles' creed thus:—

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, *which* was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, crucified, dead, and buried, went down to hell, the third day rose again from death, ascended up to heaven, sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, and from thence shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the *universal* holy church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the uprising of the flesh, and everlasting life. Amen.

"And for a more large declaration of this my faith in the *Catholic* church, I steadfastly believe, that there is but one God Almighty, in and of whose godhead are these three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that those three persons are the self-same God Almighty. I believe also, that the second person in this most blessed Trinity, in most convenient time appointed thereunto before, took flesh and blood of the most blessed Virgin Mary, for the safeguard and redemption of the universal kind of man, which was before lost in Adam's offence.

"Moreover, I believe that the same Jesus Christ our Lord, thus being both God and man, is the only head of the whole Christian church, and that all those that have been or shall be saved, be members of this most holy church.

"Whereof the first sort be now in heaven, and they are the saints from hence departed. These, as they were here conversant, conformed always their lives to the most holy laws and pure examples of Christ, renouncing Satan, the world, and the flesh, with all their concupiscence and evils.

"The other sort are here upon earth, and called the church militant. For day and night they contend against crafty assaults of the devil, the flattering *prosperities* of this world, and the rebellious filthiness of the flesh."

Such is the confession which the *modern* editors of Fox have put into the mouth of Sir John Oldcastle, traitor, heretic, and martyr, which they are pleased to describe as "well worthy of remembrance," from "its clearness and simplicity." But, reader, though Sir John *might* make this confession, it was not the creed he always held, and he made other acknowledgments, which it did not suit the convenience of the "few plain Christians" to make public. These modern editors set forth that their purpose in publishing this *Book of Martyrs*, was to "diffuse a knowledge and love of the genuine principles of Christianity;" but they have taken special care to SUPPRESS in this edition many other things which Fox admitted in his original work, and other editors have inserted in their editions of the Martyrology. Before we notice these suppressions, we will here ask the modern editors by *whose* authority did they change the word *Catholic* for "*universal*" in the Apostles' Creed? Sir John Oldcastle, we are sure, never made use of the term "*universal*," nor could there be any occasion for it in their edition, as they allow that he professed the CATHOLIC faith in his confession. Now the Catholic faith *then* was the *same* as the Catholic faith *now*, and consequently cannot be the Protestant faith, if the endless diversities of sects into which Protestantism is divided can be called *faith*. But what will the reader say of John Fox, and John Oldcastle, and Fox's modern editors, when we inform him that this valiant martyr, this *virtuous* and *true Christian*, professed his belief in the *real presence* of the sacrament of the Eucharist, and also many other

tenets of the Catholic church, which Protestants deny? One of the editors of Fox, in his edition, remarking on the confession of faith made by Oldecastle, says, “the *sincere* Lollards had rather *confused notions* of the gospel; and it appears from some remarks of lord Hale’s, that they were not *all* of the *same* sentiments.” Men of common sense, what do you think of this! The *sincere* Lollards had *confused notions*. Well, then, what were they but men tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine, and not the disciples of that church built upon a rock, that was to remain unchangeable to the end of time. They were not *all* of the *same* sentiments; then they had none of the marks of TRUTH with them, which is always the same, and ever will be the same, as long as time endureth. To declare that men *disagreed* in their sentiments, that they had *confused notions*, and yet followed TRUTH, is an outrage to common sense, and deserves universal reprobation.

We have had occasion to speak of the reply of father Parsons to this lying compilation of Fox, who wrote while John was living. On this subject of the Wickliffian heresy and Oldecastle’s confession, the learned father is so plain and argumentative, that we should not do justice to his memory and great talents were we not to record his remarks. By so doing too, we furnish a clear proof of the consistency of the defenders of the Catholic faith, who in every age and of every nation, followed the *same* rule, and consequently wrote with the *same* spirit, namely, that of Truth. Examine the works of the Catholic controvertists from the time of the apostles and evangelists to the present day, and you will find sincerity in their language, without any confusion of notions or diversity of sentiments, on whatever concern the revealed truths of religion. This test of unity is not to be found amongst sectarians, and therefore they can have no more claim to the truths of the gospel than the heathen or publican.

We have given a picture of some of the most prominent martyrs, as Fox calls them, of the Wickliffian faction, from which the reader has learned that they were traitors to their

king, and disturbers of the country's peace; this picture is not only confirmed by father Parsons, but he goes further into the conduct of Sir John Oldcastle, and proves that he was not only a traitor, but a self-convicted heretic. Parsons writes:—"But there is yet another point worse than this; which is, that he (Fox) doth not only allow of the religion of these men, but defendeth also and justifieth their life and actions in what case soever; and though never so orderly and lawfully condemned by the church or state of those days, yea, though they were convinced to have conspired the king's murder, and ruin to the state, or had broken forth into open war and hostility against the same. As did Sir John Oldcastle (by his wife called lord Cobham) Sir Roger Acton and many other their followers, in the first year of king Henry V. which story you may read in John Stow truly related out of Thomas Walsingham, and other ancient writers.

"He setteth down also without blushing (I mean Fox) as well the records of the Chancery, as the act of Parliament itself, whereby they were condemned of open treason, and confessed rebellion; for which sixty-nine were condemned in one day by public sentence; and yet doth the mad fellow take upon him to excuse and defend them all by a long discourse of many leaves together, scoffing and jesting as well at their arraignment and sentence given, as also at the act of Parliament holden at Leicester, *anno* 2, *Hen.* 5, *cap.* 7., and in the year of Christ 1415. And after all he setteth forth, in contempt of this public judgment, a great painted pageant or picture of those that were hanged for that open fact of rebellion in St. Giles's Fields, in London, as of true saints and martyrs; namely, of Sir Roger Acton and others, p. 540. And some leaves after that again, he setteth out another particular pageant of the several execution of Sir John Oldcastle, with this title: 'The Description of the Cruel Martyrdom of Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham.' And more than this, he appointeth unto them their several festival days in red letters, (which were the days of their hanging) as unto solemn martyrs. The first upon the sixth of January,



with this title: 'Sir Roger Acton, Knight, Martyr;' and the other upon the fifth of February, with this inscription in his calendar: 'Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, Martyr.' Whereby we may see that these men do not measure things as they are in themselves, but as they serve to maintain their faction.

"And it is further to be noted, that albeit these two rebellious knights (Acton and Oldcastle) besides all other their convicted crimes, did make public profession of a far different faith from John Fox (as may be seen by the confessions and protestations set down by Fox himself) yea, and the latter of them also did openly recant all the errors and heresies that he had held before; yet, notwithstanding, will not Fox so let them go, but perforce will have them to be of his church, whether they will or no. It would be over long to rehearse many examples—some few shall you have for a taste.

"Page 512. Fox setteth down the protestation of Sir John Oldcastle with this title; 'The Christian belief of the Lord Cobham.' By which title you may see that he liketh well of his belief, and holdeth it for truly Christian. Well, mark what followeth! When, after other articles about the Blessed Trinity, and Christ's Deity, Sir John Oldcastle cometh to treat of the sacrament of the altar, he protesteth thus: 'And forasmuch as I am falsely accused of a misbelief in the sacrament of the altar, I signify here to all men that this is my faith concerning that: I believe in that sacrament to be contained very Christ's body and blood, under the similitudes of wine and bread, yea, the same body that was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, hung on the cross, died and was buried, arose the third day from the dead, and now is glorified in heaven.' This was his confession, and is related here by Fox: and will Fox agree to this, think you? It may be he will, for that he saith nothing against it at all in this place.

"But some leaves after, repeating another testimonial of the said Oldcastle's belief, witnessed by his own friends, concerning this article, he writeth thus: 'Furthermore, he

believeth that the blessed sacrament of the altar is verily and truly Christ's body in the form of bread. Upon which words Fox maketh this commentary in the margin: 'In form of bread, but not without bread, he meaneth.' Yea, John, is that his meaning? How, then, standeth this with his former words, 'Under the similitudes of bread and wine?' Is the similitude of bread, true bread? Who seeth not this silly shift of a poor baited Fox, that cannot tell whither to turn his head? But mark yet a far worse shift!

"Sir John Oldcastle, shewing his belief about three sorts of men, the one, of saints now in heaven, the second, in purgatory, the third, here militant upon earth, saith thus: 'The holy church I believe to be divided into three sorts or companies; whereof the first are now in heaven, &c.; the second sort are in purgatory, abiding the mercy of God, and a full deliverance of pain; the third, upon earth, &c.' To this speech of purgatory, Fox thought best (lest it might disgrace his new martyr) to add this parenthesis of his own, '(if any such place be in the scriptures, &c.)' And by this you may perceive how he proceedeth in all the rest, to wit, most perfidiously, like a Fox in all.

"Furthermore, he setteth down at length a very ample and earnest recantation of the said Sir John Oldcastle, taken out of the records, as authentically made as can be devised. Wherein he thus protested: '*In nomine Dei. Amen.* I, John Oldcastle, denounced, detected and convicted of and upon divers articles favouring heresy and error, &c. I, being evil seduced by divers seditious preachers, have grievously erred, heretically persisted, blasphemously answered, and obstinately rebelled, &c.' And having recounted, at length, all his former condemned and heretical opinions, he endeth thus: 'Over and besides all this, I, John Oldcastle, utterly forsaking and renouncing all the aforesaid errors and heresies, and all other like unto them, lay my hand here upon this book and evangel of God, and swear, that I shall never more from henceforth hold these aforesaid heresies, nor yet any other like unto them wittingly, &c.' All which recantation

and abjuration being related by John Fox, he saith nothing at all against it, but only that it was devised by the bishops without his consent ; alleging no one author, witness, writing, record, reason, or probable conjecture for proof thereof, but followeth the fond shift before touched by me against the Magdeburgenses of him that, being accused of heinous crimes, bringeth in first the best witnesses of all the city to prove the same against himself, and then answereth all with only saying, ‘ that they are liars, and know not what they say.’ ”

In conclusion, we beg the reader to refer to the confession put into the mouth of Sir John Oldcastle, by the modern editors of Fox, and the declaration, quoted by father Parsons from the original work of Fox, above. It will be seen by the latter, that Sir John, this “ virtuous and true Christian,” held that the church was divided into *three* sorts or companies, the second sort being in a *middle* state or purgatory ; but this article of his belief is studiously left out of the latter, and he is made to name expressly but *two* sorts. This palpable contradiction ; this barefaced suppression of a material fact in the original work, by the modern editors, is sufficient to stamp their character for veracity, and consign them to the too numerous company of *falsifiers* produced by the pretended Reformation. It is clear, from the words of father Parsons, that when Wickliffe began to dogmatize, the belief of whole Christendom was that of the Catholic faith, and that he and his disciples were *not* Protestants, because they held doctrines which Protestants deny. The real presence, the invocation of saints, purgatory, and the seven sacraments, were then, as now, articles of Catholic faith, though rejected by Protestants. Tithes, surplice fees, benefices, oblations, and every emolument pertaining to temporal aggrandizement are now maintained by Protestants of the church, as by law established, though these were disputed by Wickliffe and the Lollards ; yet are they ranked by Fox and his editors as virtuous and true Christians, and godly martyrs, while authentic history represents them as the most depraved and

perfidious traitors. If to disturb the peace of society, by the propagation of seditious doctrines; if to rebel against the lawful authorities of the state, from motives of faction; if to set father against son; brother against brother; if to involve the country in murder and strife, and violate all the principles of charity, be the essence of Christianity, why then Wickliffe and his disciples were true and virtuous Christians. But that flame could not be the light of the gospel, which only blazed like a meteor, and was heard of no more; nor is its appearance known now but only by the evils produced by its exhalations. To sum up the true causes of Wickliffe's doctrine, so highly extolled by Fox, they were, 1st. A desire of revenge against the bishops and the clergy, on the part of Wickliffe, in consequence of his being deprived of a benefice in Oxford, which he had possessed unjustly. 2dly. He was moved with envy against monks, together with a desire of gaining over the Duke of Lancaster, who had an eye to the crown, and his followers, by teaching them that it was lawful to invade church livings at their pleasure; and 3rdly. The duke and his adherents were stirred up by the same motives of ambition, covetousness, and emulation against the bishops and clergy. These causes we gather out of Stow and Walsingham, and they are confirmed by the general voice of all the world. The opinions of Wickliffe were condemned by the whole universal church as heretical; and the parliaments of Richard II., and Henry IV., who best knew their lives, condemned his followers by their public acts, for "hypocrites, seditious, and pernicious people in manners." Here, then, we close our remarks on the Wickliffites, having, we flatter ourselves, satisfactorily established the real character of this class of Fox's martyrs.

#### GREAT SCHISM IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

During the heresy of Wickliffe, the Christian church was afflicted with schism, originating from the ambition of some of the cardinals, and the loose conduct of others, which pope

Urban VI. was desirous of reforming. This schism was noticed by Fox, in his account of the proceedings against Wickliffe, but we passed it over, rather than interrupt the order of the subject. Fox imputes this event to the providence of God, in favour of the progress of truth, and lest it might be thought that there was some failure of the promises of Christ in the church of Rome, we have deemed it right to place the martyrologist's account upon record, and a counter-relation of the affair after it, that the reader may be allowed to judge for himself, how far Fox is entitled to credit. He writes, under the above head,—“A circumstance occurred at this period, by the providence of God, which greatly tended to facilitate the progress of truth. This was a great schism in the church of Rome, which originated as follows: After the death of Gregory XI., who expired in the midst of his anxiety to crush Wickliffe and his doctrines, Urban VI. succeeded to the papal chair. This pope was so proud and insolent, and so intent on the advancement of his nephews and kindred, which he frequently accomplished by injuring other princes, that the greatest number of his cardinals and courtiers deserted him, and set up another pope against him, named Clement, who reigned eleven years. After him Benedict XIII., who reigned twenty-six years. Again, on the contrary side, after Urban VI., succeeded Boniface IX., Innocent VIII., Gregory XII., Alexander V., and John XIII. To relate all the particulars of this miserable schism, would require volumes; we shall merely take notice of a few of the principal occurrences, from which the reader may form an idea of the bloodshed and misery brought on the Christian world by the ambition and wickedness of these pretended representatives of our blessed Saviour; and may judge how widely they departed from his blessed maxims of peace and good will to all men. Otho, Duke of Brunswick and Prince of Tarentum, was taken and murdered. Joan, his wife, Queen of Jerusalem and Sicily, who had sent to pope Urban, besides other gifts, 40,000 ducats in gold, was afterwards, by his order, committed to prison, and



there strangled. Many cardinals were racked, and tortured to death ; battles were fought between the rival popes, in which great multitudes were slain. Five cardinals were beheaded together after long torments. The bishop of Aquilonnensis, being suspected by pope Urban, for not riding faster when in his company, was slain on the spot, by the pope's order. Thus did these demons in human form torment each other, for the space of thirty-nine years, until the council of Constance."

Fox here insinuates that it would require volumes "to relate all the particulars of this miserable schism," and he goes on to tell us that cardinals were racked and put to death, battles were fought, and murders committed by "these demons in human form," namely, the popes or anti-popes, for we are left to conjecture, as it cannot be supposed that all these horrible crimes are to rest upon Urban's shoulders, though he is the only pope accused by name. We cannot tell from whence Fox borrowed his testimony, as he has given us no reference, according to custom, but we have no hesitation in pronouncing the statement to be a tissue of falsehoods, excepting that a schism *did* exist. We have looked into the authorities within our reach, but we cannot find any allusion to the horrible transactions related by Fox, and we think it very improbable, that, had five cardinals been *beheaded* together, such a circumstance would have escaped their notice. Fox represents Urban as a monster of cruelty and injustice ; other authors, who are more entitled to credit, give a different version to his character. The Rev. J. Reeve, in his *History of the Christian Church*, says of Urban, that he was "famed for his knowledge of the canon law, devout, humble, and disinterested ; an enemy to simony, zealous for justice and purity of morals ; virtuous and learned himself, he encouraged virtue and learning in others. The abuses committed by the agents and officers of the court of Rome had long been the subject of complaint. A laudable zeal for effecting a reform, carried the religious pontiff to a degree of severity which was thought imprudent. In his exhortations

and reprimands, he spared not the cardinals themselves. They felt the justness of his animadversions, but rather than curtail their luxuries of life, they chose to throw the whole church into confusion." Thus then, it appears that this schism did not arise from the injustices of Urban, but from his desire, his too anxious wish, to have those abuses removed, which had crept into the court over which he presided. The cardinals fled from him, not for his cruelty, but for his honesty. He was a reformer of real abuses, and therefore it cannot be wondered that he should meet with opposition from those who stood in need of reform; nor can we be surprised that his meritorious intentions are misrepresented by those who delight in calumny and falsehood. As to the murders of dukes and cardinals and queens, the falsity of these charges are too glaring to need refutation. That there was a schism in the church at this period is not denied, but a schism is not a failure of orthodoxy. Though there might be a doubt as to the canonical head of the church, there was not the slightest disagreement as to the articles of faith propounded. The fact is, there was a dispute among the clergy respecting who was the rightful head of the church, and some nations adhered to one claimant and some to the other; but during the space of this contention about the headship, there was not a division on doctrine, save and except the heresy of Wickliffe, which was not of that nature to require the convening of a general council, the guardians of the church in England, that is, the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the kingdom, being deemed sufficient. Subsequently, the errors spreading on the continent, and the schism continuing, the council of Constance assembled to put an end to one, and give judgment on the other.

This council met on the 5th day of November, in the year 1414, and, like the other general councils of the Catholic church, was composed of the most eminent prelates and divines from Italy, Germany, France, Spain, and England. Here then we have a tangible proof of the existence of a church, that should be a judge and a guide to those who

were unruly and in error. Our blessed Saviour told his disciples, as the gospel of St. Matthew informs us, that when any dissensions took place, as was natural to human frailty, an appeal was to be made to THE CHURCH, and, when the church had decided, those who refused to hear her were to be considered as heathens or publicans; that is, cut off from her communion, and deprived of the spiritual blessings her Divine Founder had commissioned her to dispense. Now, if there had been no authority to decide on this schism, it would have lasted till this day, and in all probability exhibited the same features we now behold in Protestantism,—an endless division of sectarians, and an innumerable number of unbelievers. But here, as we before observed, we have a proof of the divine hand, in the protection of his church. She was threatened with a division of the seamless garment, but her guardians assembled, under the protection of the Holy Spirit, in the city of Constance; overtures were made to settle the matter amicably, the parties would not consent; they were deposed, a new pope was elected; the whole universe acknowledged the choice, and a termination was put to the jarrings that had too long distracted the peace of the church, but had never shook her faith. Thus then, by the providence of God, to use the words of Fox, that event which the enemies of Truth had anticipated would prove the downfall of the Church, was the means of establishing her solidity in the eyes of the world, and from that day to this moment, schism never infected the centre of supremacy.

## THE REFORMATION.

We now enter upon the most important epoch of English, we may say general, History, that can interest the mind, and shall have to detail a series of events,—some highly expressive of the divine nature of the Catholic church, and others declaratory of the evils attending an unbridled sway of the human heart. It will also be our duty to detect the manœuvres practised by the interested slaves of faction and irreligion, to draw the unsuspecting from the road to Heaven. We do not, however, intend to exclude from our history the great political changes that took place in the progress of the creeds, which have, in part, supplanted the ancient faith. We have undertaken to examine and criticise the most material facts recorded of the Reformation in the late edition of *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, and it will be our duty to follow the author, step by step, as we have hitherto done by his preceding statements, through this eventful period. In the performance of this task we shall meet with many facts so interwoven with divinity and politics, that, it will be impossible to separate them without making the history incomplete. We shall therefore endeavour to elicit the TRUTH in the best manner we can, and rely upon the candour and good sense of the reader for our reward.

## “PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION UNDER HENRY VIII.”

Under this head or title, Fox ushers in his narrative of king Henry's reign. He commences with these words;—“The reader will, doubtless, attend to the transactions recorded in his reign, with peculiar interest. It was in this period that God, through the instrumentality of the king,

*liberated* this country from the *Papal yoke*, when England became, as it were, a RELIGIOUS WORLD dependant on itself." He then goes on to notice the termination of the civil wars between the two houses of York and Lancaster, by the accession of Henry the Seventh, who married the princess Elizabeth, heiress of the house of York, by whom he had Henry the Eighth, "the instrument under God," Fox says; he should rather have said the great enemy of mankind, by which this country was separated from the universal Church of Christ. Fox then mentions the popular actions of the latter Henry on coming to the throne, his disgracing and punishing Empson and Dudley, the ministers of his father's avarice, and his great acquirements in literature and the sciences. Amidst these many good qualities, Fox tells us he was open to flattery, and, with his usual malice towards the clergy of that day, he charges them with administering this subtle poison in copious draughts. He also records Henry's entering the list of controversy with Luther, by writing a work on the Seven Sacraments of the Catholic church, for which the pope bestowed upon him the title of *Defender of the Faith*, still retained by the sovereigns of these realms, though the modern editors say in a note, "absurdly enough." This work of Henry is still in circulation, and is held in repute. Luther wrote an answer, but with such coarse language and invective, as gave scandal to his friends and joy to his enemies. Ass, blasphemers, liars, were some of the epithets bestowed upon the royal author. Henry complained to the German reformer's patron, and the princes of that country, considering Luther's work an insult to crowned heads, he was induced to write an apology, and offered to write a book in the king's praise. The apology, however, did not please the king, because Luther hinted that Henry was not the author of the Defence of the Seven Sacraments, and that he was beginning to favour the new doctrine. He accordingly wrote an answer to Luther, and avowed himself the author of the work which bore his name. This exasperated Luther, and in a boiling rage, he publicly announced his regret that he



had stooped to apologise to Henry. Such was the result of the dispute between Henry and Luther. Fox next gives us a "character of cardinal Wolsey," and "the manner of promotion to bishoprics and abbeys:" the latter having but little relation to the main subject, we shall pass over. Wolsey may certainly be considered the first instrument of the Reformation, as it is called, he being the principal instigator of that coldness which ensued between Henry and his virtuous queen Catharine, after nineteen years affectionate cohabitation. The cardinal was proud, aspiring, ambitious, witty, revengeful, and malicious. Catharine, who was woman of irreproachable conduct, devout without ostentation, and endowed with skill and penetration, could not endure the cardinal; and her nephew, Charles V., refusing to grant this ambitious churchman the archbishopric of Toledo, to which he aspired, as well as to the popedom, Wolsey determined to be revenged of the nephew, who was out of his reach, by seeking the ruin of the aunt. He therefore, Camden says, "caused a scruple to be put into the king's head that his present marriage with queen Catharine, who before had been his brother's wife, was forbidden by the law of God."

It was Wolsey, too, who first set the work of dissolution on foot, by obtaining several grants from the king and the pope, to suppress about forty monasteries, and to appropriate their revenues to the erecting and supporting two noble colleges he had projected at Ipswich and Oxford. Although there was a sensible difference in the motives of this measure, and the general destruction of the religious houses, which afterwards followed, yet if we may be allowed to hazard an opinion on the dispensations of Providence, the proceedings of Wolsey were offensive to the throne of Heaven.

Stow says, the monasteries suppressed by the cardinal were of "good fame and bountiful hospitality," and he relates the following disastrous consequences which befell the principal actors in this work of suppression. "In the executing of this business, five persons were his chief instruments, who on a time made a demand to the priory and convent of the

monastery of Daventry, for occupying of certain of their grounds, but the monks refusing to satisfy their requests, straightway they picked a quarrel against the house, and gave information to the cardinal against them, who taking a small occasion, commanded the house to be dissolved, and to be converted to his new college, but of this irreligious robbery done of no conscience, but to patch up pride, which private wealth could not furnish, what punishment hath since ensued at God's hands (says mine author) partly ourselves have seen, for of these five persons, two fell at discord between themselves, and the one slew the other, for the which, the survivor was hanged; the third drowned himself in a well: the fourth being well known, and valued worth two hundred pounds, became in three years so poor, that he begged till his dying day: and the fifth, called doctor Allan, being chief executor of these doings, was cruelly maimed in Ireland, even at such time as he was a bishop: the cardinal falling after into the king's greivous displeasure, was deposed, and died miserably: the colleges which he meant to have made so glorious a building, came never to good effect; the one at Ipswich clean pulled down, and the other in Oxford unfinished; and pope Clement himself, by whose authority these houses were thrown down to the ground, was after inclosed in a dangerous siege within the castle of St. Angelo in Rome, by the imperials, the city of Rome was pitifully sacked, and himself narrowly escaped with his life." Such was the beginning of the work of Reformation, as it is called, but which is more properly styled the deeds of devastation, and such was the end of the performers of this first scene of the drama.

The next subject we find in Fox is the imprisonment of Hun for heresy, and his *murder*, as he terms it. This circumstance is not connected with the Reformation, still we must notice it, as it shows the glaring disregard of truth in this instance as in numerous others, which we have detected. Fox says,—“Not long after this, (alluding to a pretended contest concerning ecclesiastical immunity), an event occurred, that was productive of great consequences. Richard Hun, a

merchant in London, was sued by his parish-priest for a mortuary in the legate's court; on this his friends advised him to sue the priest in the temporal court for a *præmunire* for bringing the king's subjects before a foreign and illegal court. This incensed the clergy so much that they contrived his destruction. Accordingly, hearing that he had Wickliffe's bible in his house, he was upon that put into the bishop's prison for heresy; but being examined upon sundry articles, he confessed some things, and submitted himself to mercy; upon which they ought, according to law, to have enjoined him penance, and discharged him, this being his first crime; but he could not be prevailed upon by the terror of this to let his suit fall in the temporal court; so one night his neck was broken with an iron chain, and he was wounded in other parts of his body, and then knit up in his own girdle, and it was given out that he had hanged himself; but the coroner's inquest, by examining the body, and by several other evidences, particularly by the confession of the sumner, gave their verdict that he was murdered by the bishop's chancellor, Dr. Horsey, and the bell-ringer. The spiritual court proceeded against the dead body, and charged Hun with all the heresy in Wickliffe's preface to the bible, because that was found in his possession; so he was condemned as an heretic, and his body was burnt. The indignation of the people was raised to the highest pitch against this action, in which they implicated the whole body of the clergy, whom they esteemed no more their pastors, but barbarous murderers. The rage went so high that the bishop of London complained that he was not safe in his own house. The bishops, chancellor, and sumner were indicted as principals in the murder. In parliament an act passed, restoring Hun's children; but the commons sent up a bill concerning his murder, which was laid aside by the peers, where the spiritual lords had the majority."

This account, we find, is not from Fox, reader, though it is fastened upon him by the modern editors; but is extracted from "The Abridgment of the History of the Reformation

of the Church of England, by GILBERT BURNET, D. D.," an author of equal veracity as Fox, and as great a falsifier and forger. The event is here said to have been productive of *great* consequences, yet so little was the death of Hun thought of by our most popular historians, that Rapin, who was a Calvinist, and has enlarged a great deal on the supposed persecutions of the Catholic clergy, takes no notice of the circumstance at all; neither does Mr. Echard, who was a divine of the established church, make mention of Hun's death; and Dr. Lingard, in his recent admirable history, notices it but slightly, as a legend unauthenticated. Stow says nothing of the barbarous circumstances narrated by Burnet, nor of the trial of the bishop, &c. He merely says,—"Richard Hun, a merchant tailor, of London, dwelling in the parish of St. Margaret, in Bridge-street, who (for denying to give a mortuary, such as was demanded by the parson for his child being buried) had been put in the Lollard's tower, about the end of October last, was now, the 6th of December, found hanged with his own girdle of silk, in the said tower, and after, he was burned in Smithfield." This was in the year 1514, and the 6th of Henry's reign. We are not going to justify the treatment of this man, because the circumstances are not clearly before us, and the authority of *Burnet*, who, by the bye, was a bishop of William the Dutchman's making, we believe, and the originator of that huge debt which now presses the country to the ground, and steepes the people in misery and poverty, is no authority at all, seeing he neither gives *dates* nor *names*. Is it to be supposed that a murder so circumstantially related by Burnet, and attended with such horrid cruelties, would not have been more minutely detailed by Stow, if the circumstances had been true? There cannot be a doubt but he would have noticed it more fully, especially if the indignation of the people had been so great as to implicate the **WHOLE BODY** of the clergy. The story is evidently a tissue of falsehoods, interwoven with a simple fact, and fabricated for the express purpose of inflaming the people against the

ancient religion of the country. That our conjecture is true, there is every reason to suppose, and we are sure the reader will agree with us when he has read the following article from this *Book of Martyrs*.

“PERSECUTION OF THE LOLLARDS.

“In the beginning of this reign, several persons were brought into the bishop’s court for heresy, or Lollardism. Forty-eight were accused : but of these, forty-three abjured, twenty-seven men and sixteen women, most of them being of Tenterden ; and five of them, four men and one woman, were condemned ; some as obstinate heretics, and others as relapses ; and, against the common laws of nature, the woman’s husband, and her two sons, were brought as witnesses against her. Upon their conviction, a certificate was made by the archbishop to the chancery : upon which, since there is no pardon upon record, the writs for burning them must have been issued in course, and the execution of them is little to be doubted. The articles objected to them were, that they believed that in the eucharist there was nothing but material bread ; that the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, confession, matrimony, and extreme unction, were neither necessary nor profitable ; that priests had no more power than laymen ; that pilgrimages were not meritorious, and that the money and labour spent in them were spent in vain ; that images ought not to be worshipped, and that they were only stocks and stones ; that prayers ought not to be made to saints, but only to God ; that there was no virtue in holy water, or holy bread. By this it will appear, that many in this nation were prepared to receive those doctrines which were afterwards preached by the reformers, even before Luther began first to oppose indulgences.”

This is as pretty a piece of trickery as we have met with in the course of our review of this *Book of Martyrs*, and proves the shifts to which our modern editors are reduced to make out their charge of persecution. This extract we find in *Burnet’s Abridgment*, almost verbatim, with the following



passage, however, suppressed. "Those who abjured, did swear to discover all that held those errors, or were suspected of them; and they were enjoined to carry a fagot in procession, and to wear on their clothes the representation of one in flames, as a public confession that they had deserved to be burnt. There were also four in London that abjured almost the same opinions; and FOX SAYS, that six were burnt in Smithfield, who MIGHT be, PERHAPS, those whom Warham had condemned; *for there is no mention of any that were condemned, in the registers of London.*" This passage should come in between the words, "holy bread." and "By this," in the fourth line of the extract above, from the bottom. So, then, here are charges made of proceedings "against the common laws of nature," and burnings taking place, upon *mere conjecture*. There are no registers in the regular courts, and yet they "MIGHT be, PERHAPS," burned, because Fox *says* there were six that suffered in Smithfield. Dr. Lingard writes,—"In Henry's *third* and *thirteenth* years the teachers of Lollardism had awakened by *their intemperance* the zeal of the bishops; and the king, by proclamation, charged the *civil* magistrates to lend their aid to the spiritual authorities. Of the numbers brought before the primate and the bishops of London and Lincoln, *almost all* were induced to *abjure*; a few of the more obstinate forfeited their lives." And the authorities the doctor relies upon are *Fox* and *Burnet*, as we judge by a reference, so that, on the whole, we may conclude, for want of better evidence, that the number of sufferers, while the bishops continued faithful to their creed, were trifling indeed. Here let it be understood that we are not justifying the act of burning for heresy, but only detecting the extravagant and unfounded tales, so basely coined by Fox and his followers, to delude the credulous, and excite hatred against truth. What can we think of the veracity of the writer, and the gullibility of his readers, when such narratives as we have just recorded are published and believed, and believed too by a people hitherto professing to be the most enlightened

in the world! Here, as we have frequently remarked, are neither dates nor names, whereby the accuracy of the circumstances can be ascertained or detailed; it is even confessed by the original writer, though that fact is *suppressed* by the modern editors, “a few *plain Christians*,” that there is no mention of any persons being condemned in the registers of London; it is stated, that there is *no record of pardon*, and yet it is brazenly insinuated, that because there is *no pardon* there *must have been executions!!* But we trust the time is now come, when the people of England *will* think for themselves, and not take every shallow and inconsistent narrative that dwells upon the supposed cruelties of ancient Catholic times for gospel truths. Is it not more probable, that since there were no registers of executions, and no record of pardon in the chancery, and the authors and editors were unable to give a name to the sufferers, that these martyrs are only victims of straw—phantoms of the imagination, conjured up for the basest of purposes, and reflecting indelible disgrace on those who have been so besotted as to give credit to such villanous fabrications?

With regard to the doctrinal articles which are here objected to, we have proved beyond dispute, in our first volume of this work, from the testimony of the fathers of the first five ages of the church, when she is allowed by Protestants to have been pure, that they were taught and believed by that church, as derived from the apostles; they were received by the Saxons, when Catholicism was first planted in the island, by St. Augustin; they continued to be believed by the people from that time to Henry’s reign; and is it consistent with common sense, that a few ignorant men, unversed in history, uninformed of the real sense of scripture, and unacquainted with the sentiments of the fathers and doctors of the church whose writings were then confined to the libraries of the colleges and bishops—is it consistent, we say, with common sense, that these illiterate people should set up their silly and vain notions in opposition to the general voice of the kingdom? Is it consistent with common sense to believe that

they only were right, and all the rest of the world were wrong? But what shall we think of such men as Fox and Burnet, who both held benefices in the Church of England, applauding fanatics who held, among other opinions, "that priests had no more power than laymen?" If this were true, why did Fox and Burnet officiate as clergymen? We will not say as priests, because they were not entitled to that sacred character, as both disavowed the great Christian sacrifice of the Mass, which was celebrated by the apostles, by the command of their Divine Master, and has been celebrated by the priests of the Catholic church from that time to this. These two worthies, would, no doubt, have sent Master John Wickliffe to the stake with very little ceremony, had he been alive in their time; but as he was opposed to the then order of things, that is, to a Catholic establishment and some doctrines of the Catholic church, though he held the chief of what Fox and Burnet deny, these rogues in grain seized the opportunity of making him an instrument to blind the people of England by misrepresenting facts, and making him the apostle of truth, when he was the preacher of error. For example: the Lollards are represented as objecting to the sacrament of baptism, as being neither profitable nor necessary. Now Fox and Burnet's church, by law established, expressly says in her catechism, that baptism is necessary to salvation. Could then these Lollards preach a true doctrine, and the church of England be right at the same time? But enough has been said to shew the palpable discrepancies amongst these reformers, or rather deformers, of religion, and pretended martyrs to truth.

#### PROGRESS OF LUTHER'S DOCTRINE.

We must here remind the reader that we are not now reviewing the work of John Fox, but of the right reverend father in God, GILBERT BURNET, bishop of Sarum, who wrote a history of his own time, which work for lying and misrepresentation was a counterpart of John Fox's notorious *Acts and Monuments of the Church*, commonly called the

*Book of Martyrs.* This history by Burnet, being too bulky and expensive for general circulation, he made an *abridgment* of it, and it is from this abridgment the “few plain Christians” have extracted the account of the “progress of the Reformation,” as coming from Fox’s pen. These things premised, let us now see what this famous, or rather infamous, writer and church of England bishop had to say on Luther’s preaching. “The rise and progress of the doctrines of Luther,” he says, “are well known; the scandalous sale of indulgences gave the first occasion to all that followed between him and the church of Rome; in which, had not the corruptions and cruelties of the clergy been so visible and scandalous, so small a cause could never have produced so great a revolution. The bishops were grossly ignorant; they seldom resided in their dioceses, except on great festivals; and all the effect their residence at such times could have, was to corrupt others by their ill example. They attached themselves to princes, and aspired to the greatest offices. The abbots and monks were wholly given up to luxury and idleness; and their unmarried state gave infinite scandal to the world: for it appeared that the restraining them from having wives of their own made them conclude that they had a right to all other men’s. The inferior clergy were no better; and not having places of retreat, to conceal their vices in, as the monks had, they became more public. In short, all ranks of churchmen were so universally despised and hated, that the world was very easily possessed with prejudice against the doctrines of men whom they knew to be capable of every vice; and the worship of God was so defiled with gross superstition, that all men were easily convinced, that the church stood in great need of a reformation. This was much increased when the books of the fathers began to be read, in which the difference between the former and latter ages of the church did very evidently appear. It was found that a blind superstition came first in the room of true piety; and when by its means the wealth and interest of the clergy were highly advanced, the popes had upon that established their

tyranny ; under which all classes of people had long groaned. All these things concurred to make way for the advancement of the Reformation ; and, the books of the German reformers being brought into England, and translated, many were prevailed on by them. Upon this, a furious persecution was set on foot, to such a degree, that six men and women were burnt in Coventry in passion-week, only for teaching their children the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments in English. Great numbers were everywhere brought into the bishops' courts ; of whom some were burnt, but the greater part abjured." He then mentions Henry's book against Luther, and continues,—“ Tindal's translation of the New Testament, with notes, drew a severe condemnation from the clergy, there being nothing in which they were more concerned, than to keep the people unacquainted with that book. Thus much may serve to shew the condition of affairs in England, both in church and state, when the process of the king's divorce was first set on foot.”

So much for the affairs of England, both in church and state, when the divorce was set on foot, according to Burnet's story ; we shall, however, be able to place them in a very different light, and upon the testimony of unimpeachable witnesses, which Burnet scorns to produce, but contents himself with his own bare assertions. In the first place, it was not the sale of indulgences that first set Luther to oppose the church, but a supposed neglect of the pope, in appointing the Dominican order of the church to preach these indulgences, instead of the Augustinian order, of which latter Martin Luther was then a prominent member. Martin conceived his pride to be wounded, and from this spirit of pride and jealousy arose the disputes which afterwards followed between him and the church of Rome. That there was a laxity of discipline among some of the clergy cannot be denied, but the doctrine was unimpaired and continued the same as it ever had been, and ever will be. That there was gross ignorance in the higher order of the clergy, or lasciviousness among the monks, is a base insinuation, as we shall shew by and by ; that *reports*



of such a nature were industriously circulated to screen the designs of Henry and his courtiers in their invasion of church property is true enough, but they were mere reports; not a single charge of the kind was ever substantiated, while numerous instances occurred where learned and pious men laid down their lives rather than sacrifice their conscience. That the unmarried state of the clergy gave infinite scandal to the world is clearly contradicted by the English act of parliament passed in the reign of Edward VI., which allowed the new order of parsons to marry, yet nevertheless declared that it would be more edifying to the people, if they remained single. That all ranks of churchmen were universally despised and hated, is contradicted by the fact that the people rose in many parts of England in defence of the clergy and the monasteries, which may be seen by consulting the historians of the country. Of superstition and the tyranny of the popes we shall say nothing—the supposed tyranny of the pope was changed for an absolute despotism in the monarch, and England's liberties were bartered when a base parliament gave spiritual supremacy to Harry. The furious persecution set on foot, in consequence of the translation of German books into English never existed, except in the brain of Fox or Burnet; and the execution of the six men and women for teaching their children the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the commandments in English, is one of the most brazen falsehoods ever told. The people of all countries were, from the commencement of Christianity, *all* taught to repeat the Lord's prayer, and instructed in the commandments and creed in their vernacular tongue, and parts of Scripture were explained to them by the clergy in the same familiar way. To represent, therefore, that men and women were burned for performing a duty to their children enjoined them by the Catholic church, (for such was the case:)—the clergy taught both parents and children, and the parents were exhorted to aid the clergy by reminding them of their duty—to represent, we say, men and women as being burned for such an act, is one of the most frontless, most malignant, and most diabo-

lical falsehoods, ever invented to blacken and defame the oldest class of Christians in the world.

We must now say a word on the morals of the world, when Luther began to preach *his* doctrines, and the state they were in *after* his doctrines had taken root. Burnet states the bishops were grossly ignorant, the regular clergy absorbed in luxury and debauchery, the inferior clergy public scandalizers by their unblushing immorality, and the people groaning under a system of despotism and blind superstition. We have admitted that, there was a laxity of morals among both clergy and people, but certainly not to that extent here described. Had there not been a debasement of conduct among the clergy, we should not have had such a crew of beastly reformers as sprung up after the example set them by Luther. What the effects of their pretended reforms in religion produced let them bear testimony themselves, and in so doing we shall see them contradicting the description given by Burnet of the state of Catholicism at that period. "Heretofore," says Luther, that is, in the days of Catholicism, "heretofore, when we were *seduced* by the pope, every man willingly *performed good works*, but NOW no man says or knows any thing else but how to get all to himself by exactions, pillage, theft, lying, usury, &c." *Postil. super Evang. Dom. 26. post Trin.* Here then we have the acknowledgment of Luther himself, that, before he began to preach, every man was occupied in performing *good works*, and surely the exercise of good deeds could not be productive of ignorance and immorality. He may call it being seduced by the pope, but who is the man, who is the Christian, that would not be seduced to perform the works of charity, rather than be charmed by some evil spirit to delight in the ways of the devil, as Luther confesses was the case with those who embraced his doctrines. A great outcry has been raised against the sale of indulgences in the Church of Rome; now that no ill effects were derived from *this* traffic, allowing for the sake of argument that such a mart was established, is proved by the testimony of Luther, who says, that men then delighted

in the performance of good works, an indulgence certainly very commendable, and highly conducive to the happiness of a people. But the moment Luther began to preach against the sale of indulgences, he gave such a gratuitous license to his followers to indulge in all the base passions of human nature, that shortly after, he tells us, every kind of good doings was totally obliterated from their minds, and the sole study of every individual was "how to get all to himself by *exactions*, pillage, theft, lying, usury, &c." And he further states, "that men were then more revengeful, covetous, and licentious than they ever were in the papacy." But need we wonder that such should be the result of the progress of Luther's doctrines, when the preacher himself was a prey to his own lust and intemperance? We have it from his own pen that he had conferences with the devil, and in the preface to the first tome of his works he thus describes the state of his own mind, and his disposition towards God, previous to his commencing reformer. "I was mighty desirous," he says, "to understand Paul in his Epistle to the Romans; but was hitherto deterred, not by any faintheartedness, but by one single question in the first chapter, viz., *therein is the righteousness of God revealed*. For I *hated* that word, *the righteousness of God*: because, I had been taught to understand it of that *formal and active righteousness*, by which God is righteous and punishes sinners and the unrighteous. Now knowing myself, though I lived a monk of an irreproachable life, to be in the sight of God a sinner, and of a *most unquiet conscience*, nor having any hopes to appease him with my own satisfaction, *I did not love, nay, I hated this righteous God*, who punishes sinners, and with *heavy muttering*, if not with *silent blasphemy*, *I was angry with God*, and said, as if it were not enough for miserable sinners, who are lost to all eternity by original sin, to suffer all manner of calamity by the law of the Decalogue, unless God by the gospel adds sorrow to sorrow, and even by the gospel threatens us with his righteousness and anger. *Thus did I rage with a fretted and disordered conscience.*" What a fit apostle to

reform religion ! What precious marks of a divine commission ! What charming fruit must such a tree produce ! Here we have a man declaring that he hated a righteous God ; that he raged and fretted with a disordered conscience : that he muttered against the will of heaven, and silently blasphemed his justice—and yet this man, this impious wretched blasphemer, is held up as the pattern of excellence, and the reformer of that system which its Divine Founder said should never be reformed. This libidinous monk taught that, adultery was lawful, notwithstanding one of the commandments of God is so positive against that crime ; he said that, “ a person that is baptized could not, though he would, lose his salvation by any sins how grievous soever, unless he refused to believe. For no sin could damn a man but unbelief alone.” *Capt. Bab.* tom. ii. fol. 74, 1. Where is the wonder that men should be guilty of lying, theft, usury, exaction, and the like, when they had such a blessed counsellor in this reformer of religion ? Again he says, “ The Papists teach that faith in Christ justifies indeed, but that God’s commandments are likewise to be kept. Now this is directly to deny Christ and abolish faith.” *In Ep. ad Gal.* tom. v. fol. 311, 2. An excellent mode of reasoning, if such it can be called. If the commandments are not to be kept why were they enjoined ? Before we take leave of Luther we will just mention his golden rule for the interpretation of scripture, which can be considered in no other light than a general indulgence to commit every degree of enormity that a man’s inclinations may lead him to. “ Let this,” he says, “ be your rule ; where the scripture commands the doing a good work, understand it in this sense, *that it forbids thee to do a good work*, because thou canst not do it.” *Tom.* iii. fol. 171, 2.

What the “ few plain Christians ” will say to this rule of interpreting scripture, we cannot divine ; the effects of it, however, have been dreadful, as we gather from the page of history, and the writings of the reformers themselves. Calvin wrote in similar strains to Luther, on the increase of iniquity among the disciples of the Reformation, so called.

“Of the many thousands,” he said, “who, renouncing Popery, seemed eagerly to embrace the gospel, how *few* have amended their lives ! Nay, what else did the greater part pretend to, but by shaking off the yoke of superstition, give themselves more liberty to follow all kinds of licentiousness.”—*Lib. de scandalis*. Erasmus, who was no advocate for the Catholics, lamented the degeneracy of morals brought on by the change of religion. “Take a view,” he says, “of this evangelical people,”—the Protestants—“Perhaps ’tis my misfortune ; but I never yet met with one, who does not appear changed for the worse.”—*Epist. ad Vultur. Neoc.* And again : “Some persons,” says he, “whom I knew formerly innocent, harmless, and without deceit, no sooner have I seen joined to that sect, (the Protestants), but they begun to talk of wenches, to play at dice, to leave off prayers, being grown extremely worldly, most impatient, revengeful, vain, like vipers tearing one another.—I speak by experience.”—*Ep. ad Fratres infer. Germaniæ*. “The greater part of the people,” adds Bucer, “seem to have embraced the gospel, only to live at their pleasure, and enjoy their lusts and lawless appetites without control. Hence they lend a willing ear to the doctrine, *that we are justified by faith only, and not by good works*, for which they have no relish.”—*Burde Regn. Christ. b. 1. c. 4*. There is one more witness we shall produce, because his testimony goes to shew that lying, and perjury, and forgery, were the instruments by which the reformers maintained their ground, and cheated the people out of their senses. “I am indignant,” says the Protestant professor Zanchius, “when I consider the manner in which most of us defend our cause. The true state of the question we often, on set purpose, involve in darkness that it may not be understood ; we have the impudence to deny things the most evident ; we assert what is visibly false ; the most impious doctrines we force on the people as the first principles of faith, and orthodox opinions we condemn as heretical ; we torture the scriptures till they agree with our own fancies ; and boast of being the disciples of the fathers, while we



refuse to follow their doctrine ; to deceive, to calumniate, to abuse, is our familiar practice ; nor do we care for any thing, provided we can defend our cause, good or bad, right or wrong. O what times ! what manners !"—*Zanchius ad Stormium*, tom. viii. col. 828.

We have advanced enough to shew "the rise and progress of Luther's doctrines" in a different light than what Burnet has pourtrayed them. He has, with the same dexterity as Fox, and other reformed writers, followed the course complained of by Zanchius. The true question is studiously involved in darkness, that it may not be clearly seen ; facts the most evident are denied or suppressed ; the most impious doctrines are imposed upon the people as divine truths ; and the scriptures are tortured and twisted to suit the notions of every cobbler or coalheaver that fancies himself inspired. How different are the ways of the Catholic church. Regulated by one system of divine jurisprudence, and governed by the Spirit of Truth, she, in cases of difficulty, assembles the guardians of faith from the different quarters of the world, to pronounce on the novelties that may arise, and declare what is, has been, and always was, the faith of the church, received by her from Christ, through the apostles. This done, canons or laws were devised for the repressing of abuse, and the correction of morals, and thus her unity, holiness, apostolicity, and Catholicity have been made manifest to the world. The last of these general councils was held at Trent, during the progress of the Reformation, and in the seventh session the fathers of that assembly decreed as follows :—"those *who persevere in good works to the end*, and trust in God, eternal life is to be proposed, both as a grace mercifully promised to the sons of God, *through Jesus Christ*, and as a reward which, according to the promise of God, will be faithfully rendered to their good works and merits." Let the reader compare this doctrine with the irreligious preachings of the lustful reformers, and say whether the superstition of the former, as it is called, is not to be preferred to the libertinism of the latter.

## HISTORY OF HENRY'S MARRIAGE WITH CATHARINE.

The "few plain Christians" usher in this marriage with the following observations: "As this incident is so replete with consequences, a particular relation of its cause will not, it is presumed, be unacceptable to the reader;" and they then proceed with extracts from Burnet's *Abridgment*, under the name of Fox. Burnet states the marriage of Catharine with prince Arthur, and their being bedded together. He also insinuates that the marriage was consummated, though it is well known that Arthur was a sickly prince, and died soon after the marriage, and that Catharine always declared that she was a virgin when she came to Henry's bed. He further says, that the second match, between Henry and Catharine, originated from the avarice of Henry's father; that Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, objected to the second marriage, and Fox, bishop of Winchester, was for it; that "the pope's authority was *then* so well established that, it was *thought*, a dispensation was sufficient to remove all objection," and accordingly one was obtained. The two paragraphs following we quote verbatim from the *Book of Martyrs*, and we beg the reader's particular attention to the words we have put in italic characters:—

"The pope was then at war with Lewis XII. of France, and so would refuse nothing to the king of England, being, perhaps, not unwilling that princes should contract such marriages, by which the legitimation of their issue depending on the pope's dispensation, they would be thereby obliged in interest to support that authority. Upon this, *a marriage followed, the prince yet being under age*; but, the *same day* in which *he came to be of age*, he did, by his father's orders, make a protestation that he retracted and annulled his marriage.

"Henry VII., on *his death-bed*, charged his son to *break it off entirely*, being, perhaps, apprehensive of such a return of confusion upon a controverted succession to the crown, as had been during the wars of the houses of York and Lan-

easter ; but, *after* his father's death, Henry VIII., *being then eighteen years of age, married her* ; she bore him two sons, who died soon after they were born ; and a daughter, Mary, afterwards queen of England. After this, the queen *contracted some diseases that made her unacceptable to the king* ; who, at the same time, *beginning to have some scruples of conscience* with regard to the lawfulness of his marriage, determined to have the affair *investigated !* "

Did the world ever before see such a specimen of bare-faced lying as this bishop of the Church of England, this Gilbert Burnet, D. D., has here furnished. In the first paragraph he says a marriage followed the dispensation, while the prince was under age, but as soon as he came of age, obeying his father's orders like a dutiful child, he made a *protestation* that he *retracted*, and *annulled his marriage*. Now what are we to understand by this protestation, and the order of Henry's father ? If his father ordered him to annul the marriage when he came of age, how came he to permit the marriage to be contracted : and if it were in the power of Henry, on coming of age, to retract and annul the marriage, why was a dispensation required to allow him to contract the marriage, and why did he seek, twenty years after, for a dispensation from the same authority, but another person, to have the marriage annulled ? But mark, reader ; having married Henry under age, and made him when of age, according to his father's orders, protest, retract, and annul the marriage, he next marries Henry at eighteen years of age, after his father's death, and in *opposition* to his *father's dying request*, lest civil war and confusion should ensue, and he continues to live with this same wife, in connubial happiness we suppose, till disease renders her unacceptable, and *then*, the moral Henry begins to have *some scruples of conscience !* So we may suppose that had Catharine remained buxom and gay, instead of waxing old and infirm, Harry would never have had any scruples of conscience about his brother's wife, nor called for an investigation. Really when we see such gross imposture as this permitted to be circulated,

and that too for a long series of time, without contradiction, and believed by a people claiming to themselves a superiority of intellect over other nations, we feel abashed and vexed for the honour of our country. Another insinuation to notice is, that of the readiness of the pope to grant the dispensation to Henry's father, because he was at war with the king of France, and could refuse Henry the Seventh nothing. Now is not this pliant disposition contradicted by the conduct of this pope's successor, who, when applied to by Henry the Eighth to annul the contract entered into under this dispensation, would not comply with Henry's wishes, though he (the pope) was then shut up in the castle of St. Angelo, in Rome, by the emperor Charles Vth, the nephew of Catharine, and Henry was able to assist his holiness in his difficulties?

#### THE KING'S SCRUPLES CONCERNING HIS MARRIAGE.

Burnet says, "He (the king) seemed to lay the greatest weight on the prohibition, in the levitical law, of marrying the brother's wife, and being conversant in Thomas Aquinas' writings, he found that he and the other schoolmen looked upon these laws as moral, and for ever binding; and consequently the pope's dispensation was of no force, since his authority went so far as to dispense with the laws of God. All the bishops of England, Fisher of Rochester only excepted, declared under their hands and seals, that they judged the marriage unlawful. The ill consequences of wars that might follow upon a doubtful title to the crown, were also much considered. It is not probable that Henry's affection for any other lady was the origin of these proceedings; but rather, that, conceiving himself upon the point of being freed from his former marriage, he gave free scope to his affections, which settled on Anne Boleyn." Henry was certainly conversant with the writings of Thomas Aquinas, as he is said to have been intended for the church by his father, previous to the death of his brother Arthur, and was educated accordingly. This will account for his eagerness and ability in taking the lists against Luther. We will also

admit that the pope had no authority to dispense with the laws of God, and consequently that a papal dispensation to that effect was of no force. Yet we doubt much that Harry ever laid any great weight upon the prohibition of the levitical law, since the levitical law was superseded by the Christian law, and the levitical enjoined the marriage of a brother to a brother's wife, if he died without issue. But if Harry had been so fond of the levitical law, why did he not turn Jew, that he might, without scruple of conscience, have followed this law to the very letter, without all that mass of hypocrisy and dissimulation which covered his cruel and detestable actions? Burnet further says, that "all the bishops of England, Fisher of Rochester only excepted, declared under their hands and seals, that they judged the marriage unlawful." This is another mistake, since it is declared by Dr. Bailey, in his Life of Bishop Fisher, that the seals and signatures of many of the bishops were affixed to the instrument of dissent *without their privity*, though they had not the courage to make that declaration as Fisher did.

Burnet also insinuates that it is not probable that Harry's affections for any "other lady, was the *origin* of these proceedings; but rather that, conceiving himself upon the point of being freed of his former marriage, he gave *free* scope to his affections, which settled on Anne Boleyn." It may be that Harry's lust for young Anne was not the original cause of his seeking a divorce from his virtuous queen, but it is a somewhat singular way of pleading an excuse for a lecherous monarch, though well suited to a Protestant bishop, to talk of his giving *scope* to his *affections* (read passions) which at length fixed on Anne Boleyn. The plain fact is, Harry gave way to voluptuousness and debauchery, after Wolsey had gained such an ascendancy over him. Before this he attended to the royal duties, now he left business to his favourite, and courted the embraces of loose women. When he married Catharine, he was only eighteen years of age, she was twenty-six. At that time she was beautiful and lovely, as well as adorned with every amiable quality. Twenty years, attended



with delicate health, had made ravages in her person, though her mind was as pure and exalted as in her youth. The infirmities of age weaned the affections of Harry, but could not eradicate his regard for her, so powerful were the graces of her soul. While he was attached to Catharine, he preserved decency in his amours, but he was not without his mistresses! Of these Dr. Lingard enumerates as the first, Elizabeth, the daughter of Sir John Blount, and relict of Sir Gilbert Talbois, by whom he had a son. To her succeeded Mary Boleyn, daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn, and SISTER to the famous Miss Nancy, afterwards queen of England. So that Burnet was not much out when he said that Harry gave "free scope to his affections" (passions), even *before* he considered himself on the *point* of being freed from his marriage with Catharine. The origin of the divorce, we have said, may be laid to Wolsey's account, who put the scruple into Harry's head, with a view to strengthen his interest with the French court, by engaging the king to marry a sister of the king of France, and thus revenge himself the emperor Charles and his aunt Catharine; but the devil put it into Harry's head to take a liking to Anne Boleyn, that the ambitious minister might be thwarted. Anne was more cunning than her sister Mary, and would not consent to the king's wishes without she became his wife. She took care to throw out her allurements in the king's presence so artfully, that she enkindled a raging fire in Harry's breast, who resolved to have her, cost what it would.

Here let us examine a little closer into the scruples of this very scrupulous monarch, the first head of the church, as by law established. Burnet says he laid great stress upon the levitical law, and that he felt great repugnance at living with his brother's wife. But if Harry was so conscientious in this affair after having lived with Catharine twenty years, why was he not equally scrupulous in cohabiting with Anne Boleyn, her own sister having been his mistress? The stress of the divorce with Catharine laid upon prince Arthur having carnal knowledge of her, which she most solemnly denied;

but it cannot be denied that Harry had carnal knowledge of Anne's sister, yet he scrupled not to make Anne in appearance his wife. The relationship between brother and brother could not be nearer than sister and sister, it is therefore evident that Harry's scruples were a mockery and cloak for his lustful passions. Another fact, too, we may notice here, to shew what Harry himself thought of his scruples, when threatened with the danger of mortality. In the year 1528, when the king was deep in love with Miss Boleyn, the court was affected with a sweating sickness, which first made its appearance among Anne's attendants. By the king's orders she was immediately packed off to her father's seat in Kent, where she was attacked with the disease, but recovered. Harry, finding the contagion spreading among the gentlemen of his privy chamber, took the alarm, and, forgetting all his scruples of conscience, fled to his virtuous queen, whom he joined in her devotional exercises, confessing himself every day, and communicating every Sunday and festival. These particulars, Dr. Lingard tells us, may be found in the Letters of the bishop of Bayonne. Here then we find the king laying aside his "scruples," when under the fear of death, and joining the society of that woman whose marriage with whom he is represented to have considered incestuous. Nay, what is still more corroborative of the hypocrisy of these scruples, when cardinal Campegio, who was sent as joint legate with Wolsey by the pope, arrived in London, Harry sent the lady Anne away, for decency sake, and again joined the company of his queen. "He lived with her," writes Dr. Lingard, "apparently on the same terms as if there had been no controversy between them. They continued to eat at the same table, and to sleep in the same bed. Catharine carefully concealed her feelings, and appeared in public with that air of cheerfulness which she used to display in the days of her greatest prosperity. The arrival of Campegio had added to the popularity of her cause, and though Wolsey had taken every precaution to prevent disturbance, he could not silence the common voice of the people, who publicly declared, that,

let the king marry whom he pleased, the husband of the princess Mary should be his successor on the throne." We mention this last circumstance with feelings of pleasure, as it reflects the highest credit on the character of the people of England, who on all occasions have been found on the side of virtue, and have taken part with the persecuted and oppressed. We say on all occasions, because in those days of frenzy and lawless outrage, when the perjuries of Oates led innocent victims to the scaffold, and the ravings of lord George Gordon threatened destruction to the metropolis, the people were misled by interested villains, and taught to look upon the Catholics as dangerous and perfidious men. Had the people been rightly informed; had they known the real character of those who were deluding them, we have no doubt but their vengeance would have been turned upon the base conspirators against truth and justice, and the same feeling have been manifested for the oppressed Catholics as was shewn in favour of the unfortunate but magnanimous Catharine.

To enter into all the details concerning the king's marriage with Catharine, and his divorce from her, as related by Burnet, and introduced by the "few plain Christians," into the *Book of Martyrs*, would swell our Review to an enormous bulk, and tire the patience of the reader; we shall therefore pass over many of the subtleties of Burnet, and supply a few of the omissions he has made of most material facts to give a false colour to his relations. But first we must notice his insinuations against the election of popes. Speaking of the illness of pope Clement, who filled the papal chair during the agitation of the divorce, Burnet says, "About this time the pope was taken suddenly ill, upon which the imperialists began to prepare for a conclave; but Farnese, and the cardinal of Mantua, opposed them, and seemed to favour Wolsey; whom as his correspondent wrote to him, 'they revered as a Deity.' Upon this he dispatched a courier to Gardiner, then on his way to Rome, with large directions how to manage the election; it was reckoned, that on the

king of France joining heartily with Harry, of which he seemed confident, there were only six cardinals wanting to make the election sure, and besides sums of money, and other rewards, that were to be distributed among them, he was to give them assurance, that the cardinal's preferments should be divided among them. These were the secret methods of attaining that chair: and indeed it would puzzle a man of an ordinary degree of credulity to think that one chosen by such means could presume to be Christ's vicar, and the infallible judge of controversies. The recovery, however, of the pope put an end to these intrigues."

When Burnet was casting his slanders against the conclave, he should have reflected on the way he obtained his prelacy, for it would puzzle a man of more than ordinary credulity to think that men chosen as he was were filled with the Holy Ghost, though they swear it to be so with might and main. To prevent ambitious men from intriguing is impossible, while human nature remains as it is; to guard therefore against these intrigues, every precaution has been devised in the regulation of the conclave, and no pope is elected until two-thirds of the votes are given in favour of the cardinal elected. To obtain this number of votes is frequently a work of time, and as there is no communication whatever with the electors after the conclave is once closed, there is no election, we feel convinced, so pure and free from suspicion as that of the head of the Catholic church. We do not wonder that Burnet should sneer at the belief held by all Catholics, that the pope is Christ's vicar on earth; but it is to be observed, that this belief has been held by all the world at one time, and is now by the greatest part of Christendom, including many monarchs and eminent statesmen; and we cannot help feeling, that there is more of presumption in those who reject this title of the pope, so long and so universally credited, than there is of credulity in those who maintain it. As to the secret method of attaining the papal chair, we have said before, that ambitious men, like Wolsey, cannot be prevented from *aspiring* to, and *intriguing* for, so high a

dignity ; but history tells us, that those who resorted to such unjustifiable practices, like Wolsey, invariably met with a defeat.

“ In October,” Burnet says, “ Campegio arrived in England, and advised the king to relinquish the prosecution of his suit ; and then counselled the queen, in the pope’s name, to enter into a religious community ; but both were in vain ; and he, by affecting an impartiality, almost lost both sides.” And why was Campegio’s advice unavailing with the queen ? This Mr. Burnet has not thought proper to inform his readers, lest they should see too much into this scene of iniquity and injustice, which led to the deformation of religion, and paved the way for his promotion ; which would never have been the case had the old faith not been subverted. Catharine, we are told by Dr. Lingard, listened to the legate with modesty and firmness, and then gave him for answer, “ that it was not for herself that she was concerned, but for one whose interests were more dear to her than her own ; that the presumptive heir to the crown was her daughter Mary, whose right should never be prejudiced by the voluntary act of her mother ; that she thought it strange to be thus interrogated without previous notice, on so delicate and important a subject ; that she was a weak, illiterate woman, a stranger, without friends or advisers, while her opponents were men learned in the law, and anxious to deserve the favour of their sovereign ; and that she therefore demanded as a right, the aid of counsel of *her own choice*, selected from the subjects of her nephew.” Thus spoke this noble-minded and persecuted woman to the legate of the pope, and this dignified conduct she pursued throughout the whole of her cruel and unmanly case. Her request was partially granted. In addition to nine English counsellors, composed of prelates and canonists, the queen was permitted to choose two foreign advocates, provided they were natives of Flanders, and not of Spain. The two counsel came from Flanders, but left England before the trial began.

These proceedings against so virtuous and unprotected a woman occasioned loud murmurs and discontents among the



people. "Of the coming of this legate," Stow writes, "the people, especially the women, talked largely, and said, that the king would for his own pleasure have another wife, and had sent for this legate to be divorced from his queen, with many foolish words, insomuch, that whoever spoke against the marriage was of the common people abhorred and reproved, which common rumour was related to the king." Such an ebullition of popular feeling was by no means agreeable to a monarch of Harry's temperament, so he caused all the nobility, judges, counsellors, the lord mayor, aldermen, and principal citizens, to come to his palace of Bridewell, on Sunday, the 8th of November, 1528, before whom he entered into an explanation of his conduct, and the reasons which induced him to have his marriage with Catharine examined into. The speech of the king is given at length in Stow, and is so full of hypocrisy that we give the conclusion, to shew how Harry could dissemble as well as play the tyrant. After noticing the civil wars between the houses of York and Lancaster, about the succession of the crown, and the necessity of guarding against such calamities for the future, he touched on the rumours which were afloat doubting the legitimacy of the princess Mary, his daughter, in consequence of her mother having been his brother's wife, which he said, was directly against God's law and his precept. He then goes on:—"Think you, my lords, that these words touch not my body and soul; think you that these doings do not daily and hourly trouble my conscience and vex my spirits; yes, we doubt not but if it were your own cause, every man would seek remedy, when the peril of your soul and the loss of your inheritance is openly laid to you. For this only cause I protest before God, and in the word of a prince, I have asked council of the greatest clerks of Christendom, and for this cause I have sent for this legate, as a man indifferent, only to know the truth, and to settle my conscience, and for none other cause, as God can judge. And as touching the queen, if it be judged by the law of God, that she is my lawful wife, there was never thing more

acceptable to me in my life, both for the discharge of my conscience, and also for the good qualities and conditions which I know to be in her ; for I assure you all, that beside her noble parentage of the which she is descended, (as you all know), she is a woman of most gentleness, of most humility, and buxomness, yea, and of all good qualities appertaining to nobility, she is, without comparison, as I these twenty years almost have had the true experiment, so that if I were to marry again, if the marriage might be good, I would surely choose her above all other women ; but if it be determined by judgment, that our marriage was against God's law, and clearly void, then I shall not only sorrow the departing from so good a lady and loving companion, but much more lament and bewail my unfortunate chance, that I have so long lived in adultery, to God's great displeasure, and have no true heir of my body to inherit this realm. These be the sores that vex my mind, these be the pangs that trouble my conscience, and for these griefs I seek a remedy ; therefore I require of you all, as our trust and confidence is in you, to declare to our subjects our intent, according to our true meaning, and desire them to pray with us, that the truth may be known, for the discharge of our conscience, and saving of our soul ; and for declaration hereof I have assembled you together, and now you may depart." This speech shewed the king to be as consummate a hypocrite, when he thought he could carry his cause with a plausible share of religion, as he proved a despot and cold-blooded murderer, when he found himself disappointed in these views. What can we think of the man who here made such a parade about conscience, and his scruples at living with a virtuous woman, because she had been married to his brother, but remained a virgin, when he was meditating to be married to a wanton, whose sister he had kept as a mistress ? Out upon such a conscience as this. We learn, however, this fact, from the king and nobles, that it was *then* as it long had been, the belief of the whole kingdom, that the pope was the *only* legitimate authority to decide on

*spiritual* questions, which was the case between Henry and Catharine. The king and the people knew that the pope held this authority by divine right, for nothing but a divine commission could have preserved it so long, or extended it so universally as it then was, every monarch and nation in Christendom voluntarily yielding obedience to it.

On recomparing Burnet's abridgment with the account given by the "few plain Christians," we find that the latter have suppressed many facts related by the former. Now this suppression of facts is a strange way of instructing the people in the "knowledge and love of the genuine principles of Christianity." It may tend to excite "a hatred of the (supposed) crimes and corruptions of popery," but it cannot convey to the reader the least perception of truth. The account of the "Progress of the Reformation," is a garbled and unfair extraction from a partial historian, and consequently carries with it the design of misleading, instead of instructing, the people on the important matters under consideration. For example, we have a title of the coming of Campeggio into England; but, from this circumstance, and the illness of the pope, which we have before noticed, the "few plain Christians" pass over to the "queen's appeal to the pope," leaving out the commencement of the process of divorce, which occasioned the ill-fated Catharine to appeal to the common father of Christendom. By the bye, we should have noticed, that the king and his prime minister, Wolsey, left no means untried to obtain the consent of the pope, who as firmly resisted every sinister measure to seduce him from his line of duty. Involved in a dispute with the emperor, money and troops were proffered him, but Clement regarded them not. Threats were then applied with as little success. Even his sick bed was no security to him from the importunities of the emissaries of Henry, who went so far as to accuse the pontiff of ingratitude to his best friend, and of indifference to the prosperity of the church. "To all their remonstrances," writes Dr. Lingard, "he returned the same answer, that he could not refuse to Catharine what the ordi-

nary forms of justice required ; that he was devoted to the king, and eager to gratify him in any manner conformably with honour and equity ; but that he ought not to require from him what was evidently unjust, or they would find that when his conscience was concerned, he was equally insensible to considerations of interest or danger." Burnet and the "few plain Christians" may attempt to throw a stigma on the election of popes, but the words and resolution of this head of the church reflect no disgrace upon either the church or himself.

The "few plain Christians," quoting from Burnet, say, "At length the legates began the process, when the queen protested against them as incompetent judges. They, however, proceeded according to the forms of law, although the queen had appealed from them to the pope, and objected both to the place, to the judges, and her lawyers : yet they pronounced her contumacious, and went on to examine witnesses, chiefly as to the consummation of her marriage with prince Arthur." This part of the affair is so very interesting, the conduct of the oppressed queen so truly heroic, and her appeal so pathetically touching, that we should be doing injustice to the cause of religion, and leave our readers in the dark, did we not give her defence in full. The same arts practised upon the pontiff were tried upon the queen. Burnet says, (but this passage the "few plain Christians" have also omitted), "Endeavours were used to terrify her into some compliance ; it was given out that some had intended to kill the king or the cardinal, and that she had some hand in it ; that she carried herself very disobligingly to the king, and used many indecent arts to be popular ; that the king was in danger of his life by her means, and so could no more keep her company neither in bed nor at board : but (continues Burnet) she was a woman of so resolute a mind that no threatenings could daunt her." While these intrigues and menaces were being carried on against the queen, Anne Boleyn was gaining a complete ascendancy at court, and at length obtained the supreme control of the ministry. Harry

allowed her a princely establishment, ordered his courtiers to attend her daily levees, the same as they had done those of the queen, who was now banished to Greenwich.

Seven months had now elapsed since the arrival of Campegio, which time had been spent in fruitless negotiations with Rome, when it was deemed necessary that some public proceeding should take place, to bring the question to an issue. Accordingly, a court was held at the Blackfriars, the first session of which began on 31st May, 1529. Wolsey and Campegio sat as judges, being joint legates of the pope; the chief managers on the part of the king were, Dr. Sampson, Dr. Hall, Dr. Petre, and Dr. Tregonel; those that pleaded for the queen were, Dr. Fisher, bishop of Rochester, Dr. Standish, bishop of Asaph, and Dr. Ridley, a very learned civilian. Before this court the king and queen appeared, but previous to their being called, the bishop of Rochester presented the legates with a book, which he had composed in defence of the marriage; making therewith a grave and learned speech, in which he cautioned them as to what they did in so important an affair, calling to their minds the many dangers and inconveniences that might ensue, not only to the realm, but to the whole of Christendom, by their decision. The bishop having concluded, the king was called by name, who answered, Here; and repeated in substance, what he had said before the assembly of the nobility. Then the queen was called, who made no answer, but rising from her chair, she kneeled before the king, and in sight of the legates and the whole court, thus addressed him:—"Sir, I beseech you do me justice and right, and take some pity upon me! for I am a simple woman, and a stranger born out of your dominions, and have no friend but you, who now being become my adversary, alas! what friendship or assurance of indifferency in my council can I hope to find amongst your subjects? What have I done? Wherein have I offended you? How have I given you any occasion of displeasure? Why will you put me from you in this sort? I take God to be my judge, I have been a true, humble, and faithful wife unto



you ; always conformable to your will and pleasure. Wherein did I ever contradict or gainsay whatever you said ? When was I discontented at the thing that pleased you ? Whom did I love but those whom you loved, whether I had cause or not ? I have been your wife these twenty years ; you have had divers children by me : when you took me first unto your bed, I take God to be my witness, I was a virgin ; and, whether that be true or not, I put it to your conscience. Now, if there be any just cause that you can allege against me, either of dishonesty or the like, I am contented to depart the realm and you, with shame and infamy ; but, if there be no such cause, then I pray you let me have justice at your hands. The king your father was in his time of such an excellent wit, as that for his wisdom he was accounted a second Solomon ; and Ferdinand my father was reckoned to be one of the wisest princes that reigned in Spain for many years before his days. These being both so wise princes, it is not to be doubted but they had gathered unto them as wise counsellors of both realms, as they in their wisdoms thought most meet ; and, as I take it, there were, in those days, as wise and learned men in both kingdoms, as there are now to be found in these our times, who thought the marriage between you and me to be good and lawful ; but for this I may thank you, my lord cardinal of York, who have sought to make this dissension between my lord the king and me, because I have so often found fault with your pompous vanity and aspiring mind. Yet I do not think that this your malice proceeds from you merely in respect of myself ; but your chief displeasure is against my nephew the emperor, because you could not at his hands attain unto the bishopric of Toledo, which you greedily desired ; and, after that, was by his means put by the chief and high bishopric of Rome, whereunto you most ambitiously aspired ; whereat being sore offended, and yet not able to revenge your quarrel upon him, the heavy burthen of your indignation must fall upon a female weakness, for no other reason but because she is his aunt. And these are the manly ways you take to ease your

mind: but God forgive you! Wherefore, sir, (applying herself to the king), it seems, to me, to be no justice that I should stand to the order of this court, seeing one of my judges to be so partial; and, if I should agree to stand to the judgment of this court, what counsellors have I but such as are your own subjects, taken from your own council, to which they are privy, and perhaps dare not go against it? Wherefore I refuse to stand to their advice or plea, or any judgment that is here, and do appeal unto the see apostolic, before our holy father the pope; humbly beseeching you, by the way of charity, to spare me, till I may know what further course my friends in Spain will advise me to; and, if this may not be granted, then your pleasure be fulfilled."

Having concluded this tender and moving remonstrance, she rose, and making her obeisance to the king, she left the court, the members of which were extremely affected, many of them shedding tears. After it was discovered that she had taken her departure, for it was imagined that she would have returned to her place after a time, the king commanded that she should be called back again; but she resolutely refused to appear, saying to her attendants,—“This is no place for me to expect equity; for they are all agreed what they will do, and the king is resolved what shall be done.” The king finding that she would not return, and that her address had made a strong impression on the court, delivered himself as follows:—“Forasmuch as the queen is now gone, I will declare in her absence, before you all, that she hath ever been to me, as true, obedient, and conformable a wife as I could wish, or any man desire to have, as having all the virtuous qualities that ought to be in a woman of her dignity: she is high born, (as the quality of her conditions do declare,) yet of so meek a spirit, as if her humility had not been acquainted with her birth; so that if I sought all Europe over, I should never find a better wife; and therefore how willingly I would, if it were lawful, continue her to be my wife till death make the separation, ye may all guess; but conscience, conscience is such a thing,—who can endure the sting and prick of con-

science, always stinging and pricking within his breast? Wherefore, my lords, this woman, this good woman, I may say, sometime being my brother's wife, as ye all know, or have heard, hath bred such a scruple within the secrets of my breast, as daily doth torment, cumber, and disquiet my mind, fearing and mistrusting that I am in great danger of God's indignation; and the rather, because he hath sent me no issue male but such as died incontinently after they were born. Thus, my conscience being tossed to and fro upon these unquiet waves, (almost in despair of having any other issue by her,) it behoveth me, I think, to look a little farther, and to consider now the welfare of this realm, and the great danger that it standeth in for lack of a prince to succeed me in this office; and therefore I thought good, in respect to the discharging of my conscience, and for the quiet state of this noble realm, to attempt the law herein, that is, to know by your good and learned counsel, whether I might lawfully take another wife, by whom God may send me issue male, in case this, my first marriage, should appear not warrantable; and this is the only cause for which I have sought thus far unto you, and not for any displeasure or disliking of the queen's person or age, with whom I could be as well contented to live, and continue (if our marriage may stand with the laws of God) as with any woman living: and in this point consisteth all the doubt, wherein I would be satisfied with the sound learning, wisdom, and judgments of you, my lords, the prelates and pastors of this realm, now here assembled for that purpose; and according to whose determination herein, I am contented to submit myself with all obedience; and that I meant not to wade in so weighty a matter (of myself) without the opinion and judgment of my lords spiritual it may appear in this, that shortly after the coming of this scruple into my conscience, I moved it to you, my lord of Lincoln, my ghostly father: and forasmuch as you yourself, my lord, were then in some doubt, you advised me to ask the counsel of the rest of the bishops; whereupon I moved you, my lord of Canterbury, first, to have your license (inasmuch as you

were the metropolitan) to put this matter in question, as I did to all the rest ; the which you have all granted under your seals, which I have here to shew."

Here we have the king again appealing to conscience, as if he were the most scrupulous man in his kingdom ; and we have him solemnly protesting his regard and affection for his amiable queen, whose virtues he could but extol, and whose conduct towards him had been irreproachable. We have him also protesting his obedience to spiritual authority in this case as one of conscience, and acknowledging that authority against which he afterwards protested, when he found he could not gain his ends. Let us now then enter farther into the proceedings of the divorce, and see if the protestations of Harry were sincere. The king had won the archbishop of Canterbury to his design, and the archbishop had got as many of the bishops as he could to consent to the divorce under their hands and seals, and of those he could not prevail upon to give their formal consent, he took the liberty of consenting for them, and added their signatures to an instrument which had been drawn up for the purpose. Bishop Fisher, however, undauntedly denied before the king, that he had ever consented to have his hand and seal to the deed ; nor could the archbishop disprove his denial. The king, who was all submission before, now proceeded to try another line of conduct. He browbeat Fisher, and threatened him, to make the bishop come into his views. What now became of Harry's conscience ? Finding Fisher resolute, and the other bishops, who had been trepanned, silent from fear, the king consoled himself with these remarkable words :—" Well, well, my lord of Rochester, it makes no great matter ; we will not stand with you in *argument* ; you are but *one* man amongst the rest, if the worst fall out." So we see it was not the force of truth and reason that Harry wanted, but *numbers* to blind the ignorant and unthinking.

The court, though thus thrown into confusion by the disappearance of the queen, was not dissolved, and upon the next meeting there was much matter propounded. Wit-

nesses were heard touching the consummation of the marriage, and when their depositions had been taken, bishop Fisher, who, it will be remembered, was one of the queen's counsel, spoke as follows:—"All that has been said is no more than what hath formerly been deposed, examined, thoroughly debated, and scanned by the best and most learned divines and lawyers that could possibly be got; which time I do very well remember, and am not ignorant of the manner of their proceedings, when and where all the allegations (in respect of what was then produced to the contrary) were then adjudged vain and frivolous; whereupon the marriage was concluded; which marriage was afterwards approved, and ratified by the see apostolic, and that in such large and ample manner, as that I think it a very hard matter now again to call the same question before another judge."

After him stood up another of her majesty's counsel, Dr. Ridley, who is described as a little man, but of great spirit and profound learning. He said:—"My lords, the cardinals, we have heard how the queen herself, here in the face of the whole court, and in the presence and hearing of the king himself, called the great God of heaven and earth to witness, that she was a pure virgin when she first came into the king's bed, and how she put it to his conscience, speaking unto him face to face: and, if it were otherwise, we cannot imagine that either the queen durst so appeal unto him; or the king, so spoke unto (if unworthily), would not have contradicted her. Besides, we have here the testimony of a most reverend father, who hath deposed upon his oath how the queen had often, *sub testimonio consentiæ suæ*, said unto him, how that she never had any carnal knowledge of prince Arthur. Now, my lords, that such a frolic, or a jest (as that about a cup of ale, which, together with all the rest that hath been said, are but mere conjectures and presumptions,) should stand in competition with so great a testimony as a sovereign princess's solemn attestation of her cause upon the king's conscience, and that conscience clearing her from such presumption by its own silence; should cause us to lay aside all



reverence which we owe to former power and authority, as that all the determinations, consultations, approbations, confirmations of all former powers, even of the see apostolic itself, should become void, by your calling this matter again into question; is a thing, in my conceit, most detestable to be rehearsed, and a great shame to this honourable court to hear such stuff ripped up to other purpose but in contempt of former power, and calling the wisdom of our ancestors and predecessors, together with our own, into question and derision."

This defence annoyed one of the judges (Wolsey), who was supposed to be the originator of the scruple, while Campegio was intent on doing justice. He desired that Dr. Tonstal, bishop of London, should be called. This was a man of profound judgment and great erudition, and had written an excellent treatise in defence of the queen's marriage, which was intended to have been read in court, but Harry, the conscientious Harry, though professing to rely on the sound learning of the prelates, took care to have this able advocate of justice out of the way, by sending him on an embassy into Scotland. The general opinion entertained was, that if the queen had not appealed to Rome, the marriage would have been confirmed in this session of the court; but the appeal being carried to a higher tribunal, on the motion of the bishop of Ely, another of the queen's counsel, the legates determined to hear no further pleadings.

The king, who thought all was going right, found himself thus disappointed, upon which he intrigued, good conscientious man, with the cardinal of York, to get the queen to consent to the judgment of the court, but she was not to be persuaded from her first determination. The king was now growing impatient, and to bring the matter to an issue, he directed that another session should be held, at which he attended in person and urged a final sentence. The proceedings of the court having been read, the king's counsel called for judgment; on which Campegio replied in these words:—"Not so; I will give no sentence before I have

made a relation of the whole transactions of these affairs unto the pope, whereunto I am obliged by virtue of the queen's appeal, considering whose commissioners we are, and by whose authority we here sit. I come not hither for favour or dread sake, to pleasure any person living, be he king or subject; neither for any such respect sake will I offend my conscience, or displease my God. I am now an old man, both weak and sickly; and should I now put my soul in danger of God's displeasure and everlasting damnation, for fear or favour of any prince in this world, it is not all the princes in this world can give me comfort. I come hither to do justice according to my conscience; I have heard the allegations, the party hath appealed from our sentence, as supposing us to be unfit judges in her cause, being subjects (under so high authority, and in his own realm), that dare not do her justice, fearing the king's displeasure; wherefore I will not do an act which I cannot answer to God, nor my superior; and therefore I adjourn the court for this time." Thus the court was dissolved.

To illustrate the question we will digress from the present proceedings, and notice a precedent in the history of France, in which the pope's authority was more successful than in the case of Catharine. Harry's divorce is not the only instance in the annals of our own country, of royal separations, as John was divorced from his wife Avis, by some unprincipled churchmen, in order that he might marry Isabella of Angouleme, with whose beauty he was captivated. But as the repudiated wife did not seek the restoration of her conjugal rights by an appeal to Rome, the holy see did not take cognizance of the matter. It was not so, however, with the cause of Ingelburga, queen of France, about the same period. Philip, the French king, on his return from Palestine, found himself a widower, by the death of queen Isabella, and not liking a state of single blessedness, he wished to marry again. Accordingly he deputed the bishop of Noyon to the king of Denmark, with proposals to marry his sister Ingelburga. The Danish monarch assented; the princess was sent off with a

suitable train of attendants ; she arrived in France, and was married to Philip by the archbishop of Amiens. On the next day she was solemnly crowned queen of France, but by some unaccountable cause, during the ceremony Philip conceived an utter aversion for the person of his queen, and at the end of three months measures were concerted to obtain a divorce. No reason was assigned for this strange change in the king's mind ; Ingelburga was lovely and virtuous ; but a monarch's taste must be indulged.

The doctrine of the Catholic church is, that when a marriage is lawfully contracted, no power on earth can dissolve it. Even adultery is not a sufficient ground for a divorce, though it may be for a separation. Since the Reformation so called, however, it has been discovered, in this country at least, that parliament can dispense with that ordinance of our Maker,—“ What God hath joined together let no man put asunder.” It has been found, since Harry the Eighth established the precedent, that adultery is sufficient cause to dissolve the marriage contract ; so that a married couple, rich enough to pay for an act of parliament, if tired of each other's company, have only to commit an offence which God ordered the Israelites to punish with death, and they can have a parliamentary indulgence to engage in a second marriage, during each other's life.

Such a license to commit sin is not legally known in the Catholic church. There have been, and there always will be, men ready to barter the sacred functions of their office to gratify the ambition, or feed the lustful appetite of monarchs ; but the abandonment of individual duty cannot be fixed on the church collectively, unless, indeed, it can be proved that she has sanctioned by her laws and councils any such unholy doings. Thus in the case of Philip and Ingelburga, the archbishop of Rheims, who was uncle to the king, and had married him to the unfortunate queen, was weak enough to become the tool of Philip, and declared the marriage null, on the ground of consanguinity. For observe, in this case a plea was set up, to shew that the marriage was not originally

lawful, and therefore could not be binding. The proceedings were communicated to Ingelburga, who had been kept ignorant of the king's intentions, and was confined in a convent. Though ignorant of the French language, she was not ignorant of her religion. With the spiritual instructions she had received, she was taught to look upon the pope as the common father of all Christendom, and therefore as soon as she had recovered from the shock given her by the intimation, bursting into tears, she intimated that she appealed to Rome from the unjust sentence that was pronounced against her marriage. Her brother Canute, when he was informed of the treatment she had received, seconded her appeal, and sent agents to Rome, with ample proofs to invalidate the plea on which the archbishop had grounded his sentence of divorce. Proceedings of this kind move slowly at Rome, and Philip, impatient of delay, publicly married Agnes, the daughter of Bertold, duke of Bohemia. This last act Canute deemed an insult added to injury, and a defiance of justice and decorum. Instead, however, of appealing to arms, as is now the case, and shedding the blood of his subjects, he deputed other deputies to Rome, and pressed for a sentence. At this time Innocent II. filled the papal chair. Alive to every act of oppression, he warmly espoused the cause of Ingelburga, and proceeded to examine the documents. While this examination was pending, he admonished Philip to remove the adulteress, but the king was obdurate. The kingdom was laid under an interdict. Philip, in revenge, seized the temporalities of the clergy, and tried to gain them over to his ends. They, however, remained firm, refused his bribes, and told him he must submit. The king at last complied; he dismissed Agnes, and the cause of Ingelburga was to undergo another discussion. A council met at Soissons; Philip appeared on one hand, attended with the prelates and nobles of the land; on the other was the queen, with some bishops and a retinue of friends, sent from Denmark by her brother Canute. The king demanded to be separated from Ingelburga, to whom, he said, he was related within the prohibited degree. The

Danish minister appealed to the marriage treaty, and proved that the allegation of kindred was altogether unfounded. They saw, however, in the legate's countenance, who presided, a determined partiality in favour of the king, and they therefore said, We appeal from that judge to the pope. A few days after, in consequence of this objection, another legate, a man of unshaken integrity, was appointed, and the discussion was resumed. But the Danes, not imagining such haste, had left the place, and Ingelburga was without an advocate. The king's counsel pleaded, and called for a reply. At first no answer was given; but after a short pause, an unknown ecclesiastic stepped forth, meanly habited and of an humble aspect, and requested to be heard. Permission was granted; he repelled the objections, and demonstrated the law with such force and eloquence, that he carried conviction to the judges. The king was told that judgment would be pronounced against him; on which he told the legate he was satisfied, and taking Ingelburga, she was acknowledged as queen, but in return for his dismissal of Agnes, the unfortunate Ingelburga was shut up in the royal castle at Etampes, where she was secluded, not only from the king's society, but from all intercourse with the world. Innocent frequently corresponded with her, and unceasingly urged Philip to be reconciled to her. At length, after a barbarous confinement of twelve years, he took her to his bed and treated her with kindness.

We may here see, by this occurrence, the utility and benefit of having a supreme judge in matters which regard to conscience, and which are of that nature that justice could not be obtained without such an appeal. Although Philip had not the appointment of bishops in his kingdom, as is now the case with all Protestant states, yet there was always a sort of influence attached to the power of a monarch over the temporalities of the clergy that warped the judgment and conduct of many dignified ecclesiastics, as we see in history, and none more strikingly so than the reign of our eighth Harry. Against this partiality and abandonment of justice the appea



to Rome was always a barrier, and the innocent invariably found justice at the hands of the pope. Thus it was in the case of Ingelburga, and thus it will be found to be with Catharine.

There is another case, likewise, of a royal divorce, and of recent date, which we think will interest our readers, and is not irrelevant to the illustration of the question we are discussing. We allude to the divorce of Napoleon and Josephine, after the former became emperor of France. This couple were originally united under the civil code of the revolutionary reign. When, however, Napoleon took it into his head to be crowned by the late pope Pius VII., whom he dragged across the Alps in the depth of winter, and at an advanced age, to perform the ceremony, the holy father refused to place the crown on Josephine's head, or appear in the ceremony, unless they were married according to the rites of the Catholic church. In consequence of this objection Napoleon consented, and they were married by the pope himself on the eve of the coronation day. Some time after the emperor took it into his head that he must form a new dynasty, and as his present empress was too old to lead him to hope for issue, he persuaded her to consent to a divorce, that he might take to himself a youthful bride. Josephine yielded to his wish, and Napoleon found a ready ecclesiastic in the person of cardinal Maury, to whom he had promised the archbishopric of Paris, to give this divorce the mockery of a *religious* sanction. This done, Napoleon woos the eldest daughter of the emperor of Austria, a Catholic sovereign, who, for state purposes, basely consents to give her up, having found prelates to reconcile his conscience to the proceeding. This marriage, like the divorce, had the sanction of a religious ceremony from the same panderer who pronounced the separation of the first lawful marriage. But mark, though Josephine did not appeal to the pope, the holy father never would acknowledge the second marriage, nor has it ever been acknowledged by the church. Thus maintaining the incontrovertible force of the divine injunction, which forbids man to put asunder what

God has joined. The issue by this second marriage was a son; but soon after his birth the father was compelled to resign his throne, from which he was conveyed to a dreary rock, where he lingered a solitary exile till death set him free; his second empress became a widowed wife, to be pitied but unheeded, and the boy is now an orphan under the care of his grandfather. Such is the fate of those who set the precepts of God at nought, and it too often happens that the innocent are involved in the punishment brought on by the guilty. Having thus shewn how careful the Catholic church has ever been to preserve unsullied the divine commands, and how beneficial the supreme authority of the pope is to prevent injustice and check corruption, we shall now proceed in our review of the compilation of lies and mis-statements of Fox and Burnet.

The next subject introduced by the *Book of Martyrs* is an "ACCOUNT OF CRANMER," and is given in these words:—"At this period, Dr. Cranmer, a Fellow of Jesus College in Cambridge, meeting accidentally with Gardiner and Fox at Waltham, and entering into discourse upon the royal marriage, suggested, that the king should engage the chief universities and divines of Europe, to examine the lawfulness of his marriage; and if they gave their resolutions against it, then it being certain that the pope's dispensation could not derogate from the law of God, the marriage must be declared null. This *novel* and *reasonable* scheme they proposed to the king, who was much pleased with it, as he saw this way was better in itself, and would mortify the pope. Cranmer was accordingly sent for, and on conversing with him, the king conceived a high opinion both of his learning and prudence, as well as of his probity and sincerity, which took such root in his mind, that no artifices, nor calumnies, were ever able to remove it." Of the probity and sincerity of this *saint* of the Reformation, we shall have occasion to speak much hereafter, and produce facts that will shew how much he possessed of these excellent qualities. At present we must confine ourselves to his conduct before he entered on the service of the

king, as an advocate for the divorce of the marriage between Catharine and Harry. Cranmer was admitted into Jesus College, Cambridge, but was deprived of his fellowship for entering into a matrimonial engagement. How he contrived to maintain his wife we do not find related in history, but it is stated that after his wife died he betook himself again to an academical life, entered into holy orders, and became the tutor to two young gentlemen at Cambridge, sons of Mr. Cressy at Waltham, to which latter place he retired with his pupils during the time that university was infected with the plague. It was here Cranmer fell in with Fox, the king's almoner, and in the course of conversation on the marriage, Cranmer is said by Fuller, in his Church History, to have observed, that "if it could be proved that marrying a brother's wife is contrary to the law of God, a dispensation would be out of the pope's power." This remark being communicated to Harry, it agreed so well with his *conscientious* scruples, that he determined to ground his case upon it. Cranmer was now made chaplain to the earl of Wiltshire, Miss Nancy's father, and was recommended by him to the king, who employed him both in Italy, Germany, and France, to forward the cause of his divorce in the universities of those countries. Such was the man selected to manage the foreign universities, by a "novel and reasonable scheme," as the modern editors call his proposition. By the outset of his life, he appears to have been a fit instrument to conduct the nefarious business, and his subsequent demeanour will prove him to have been one of the most diabolical villains that ever stained human form.

#### THE UNIVERSITIES DECLARE AGAINST THE KING'S MARRIAGE.

After devoting a small space to the disgrace of Wolsey, we are favoured with an account of the decisions of the universities, in the following words:—"The king now intending to proceed in the method proposed by Cranmer, sent to Oxford and Cambridge, to procure their conclusions. At

Oxford it was referred by the major part of the convocation to thirty-three doctors and bachelors of divinity, whom that faculty was to name : they were empowered to determine the question, and put the seal of the university to their conclusion. And they gave their opinions, that the marriage of the brother's wife was contrary both to the laws of God and nature. At Cambridge, the convocation referred the question to twenty-nine ; of which number, two-thirds agreeing, they were empowered to put the seal of the university to their determination. These agreed in opinion with those of Oxford. The jealousy of Dr. Cranmer's favouring Lutheranism, caused the fierce Popish party to oppose everything in which he was engaged. They were also afraid of Ann Boleyn's advancement, who was believed to be tinctured with these opinions. Crook, a learned man, was employed in Italy, to procure the resolution of divines there ; in which he was so successful, that besides the great discoveries he made in searching the manuscripts of the Greek fathers concerning their opinions in this point, he engaged several persons to write for the king's cause ; and also got the Jews to give their opinions of the laws in Leviticus, that they were moral and obligatory ; yet, when a brother died without issue, his brother might marry his widow within Judea, for preserving their families and succession ; but they thought that might not be done out of Judea. The state of Venice would not declare themselves, but said they would be neutral, and it was not easy to persuade the divines of the republic to give their opinions, till a brief was obtained of the pope, permitting all divines and canonists to deliver their opinions according to their consciences. The pope abhorred this way of proceeding, though he could not decently oppose it ; but he said, in great scorn, that no friar should set limits to his power. Crook was ordered to give no money, nor make promises to any, till they had freely delivered their opinion ; which he is said to have faithfully observed. He sent over to England an hundred several books, and papers, with many subscriptions ; all condemning the king's marriage as un-

lawful in itself. At Paris, the Sorbonne made their determination with great solemnity; after mass, all the doctors took an oath to study the question, and to give their judgment according to their consciences; and after three weeks' study, the greater part agreed on this: 'that the king's marriage was unlawful, and that the pope could not dispense with it.' At Orleans, Angiers, and Toulouse, they determined to the same purpose."

The sensible reader must smile at this account, which is given by Burnet, a man who ranked as a Christian bishop, yet would persuade his readers that the Christian advocates of a Christian (so he thought himself) king, required the opinions of the *Jews*, whether his marriage, contracted under a Christian dispensation, was lawful. Well, they appear to decide against him, for, they say, when a brother died without issue, his brother might marry his widow; but to get out of this dilemma, they limit the operation of the law to Judea, for the preservation of the succession of families, and make it nugatory out of that country. What pitiful sophistry is this! Why, if the Jews were allowed to take the brother's widow in Judea, to preserve the succession, why not a king in England, especially after the church, of which he was a member, had given a sanction to the contract? Then the Oxford divines gave their opinion that "the marriage of the brother's wife was contrary both to the laws of God and nature." But on what ground did they form this judgment? On the levitical law? This could not be, since God had commanded the Jews to marry the brother's wife in certain cases. On the canons of the Christian or Catholic church? The church had already decided that the marriage *was* lawful, and had granted a dispensation through her supreme head, to prevent future cavil. The grounds of this decision was the non-consummation of the marriage, and the death of one party, which made the former contract completely void; for as Catharine was a virgin, after the death of the king's brother, she could hardly be said to have been a wife. The fact is, the decisions given by the universities were founded



on false premises, for the essential circumstance of the virginity of the queen, after the death of her first husband, was studiously and partially kept back by the propounders of the question. The Cambridge doctors disputed the case, and those who were against the divorce, were not influenced by the injustice attempted on the queen, but from a fierce jealousy of the immaculate Dr. Cranmer, forsooth, who was suspected of favouring Lutheranism; and a fear of Miss Boleyn's advancement. Burnet, we presume, in imputing these unworthy motives to men who had nothing to gain, but everything to lose, by the cause they espoused, measured his neighbour's corn by his own bushel, as he was no unwilling panderer to corruption and falsehood. Then, again, we have a learned Dr. Crook fishing up manuscripts from the Greek fathers, in Italy, condemning the marriage, as if these fathers anticipated the dispute, and left their opinions as a legacy to Harry, to indulge in his adulterous courses under their sanction. This Mr. Crook, it seems, had another commission entrusted to him, and that was, to influence the cause with the charm of money. Harry, before his nobles and people, could profess the most pious and dutiful submission to the decision of his spiritual guides and judges, and his love of his queen's virtue and person, and that if it were lawful, and he had his choice again, he would select Catharine of all women for his wife. Yet all this while the arch-hypocrite was consuming for love of Anne Boleyn, and causing search to be made for the most artful and unprincipled villains that could be found, to cheat the universities of Europe out of a decision against his virtuous and faithful partner, that he might shelter himself under the cloak of religion. But the ways of God are just, and the hoary lecher was compelled to appear in his proper garb.

So determined was the religious Harry to settle his conscience, that it seems he was not content to have the opinions of the *Jews*, but he must also have the sentiments of the *reformers*, the leader of whom he had openly attacked as a heretic and false apostle. The account given of the opinions

of these gentlemen are not less ludicrous than those of the universities. "Calvin," we are told, "thought the marriage null, and all agreed that the pope's dispensation was of no force. Osiander was employed to engage the Lutheran divines, but they were afraid of giving the emperor new grounds of displeasure. Melancthon thought the law in Leviticus was dispensable, and that the marriage might be lawful; and that, in those matters, states and princes might make what laws they pleased; and though the divines of Leipsic, after much disputing about it, did agree that those laws were moral, yet they could never be brought to justify the divorce with the subsequent marriage; but the pope was more compliant, for he offered to Cassali to grant the king dispensation for having another wife, with which the imperialists seemed not dissatisfied." From this statement there appears to have been as much difference of opinion among the *reformers*, on the question of divorce, as there was on their articles of faith. The offer of the pope to grant Harry a couple of wives, we conjecture, was introduced by Burnet to cover the disgrace of the patriarchs of the Reformation, who, by a written document, under their signatures, granted the Landgrave of Hesse permission to have two wives at once. This gentleman was a disciple of the Reformation, and, like Henry, he gave way to the lusts of the flesh, on embracing the *new* doctrines. The cause of this disorder he imputes to his wife, whom, he says, he never loved, and whose bed he left a few weeks after marriage to wallow in adultery. As a remedy, therefore, to this course of life, and without which, he avows, he will never change it, he proposes to the reforming divines to allow him to have *another* wife, on the ground, "that Luther and Melancthon, to his own knowledge, advised the king of England not to break off the marriage with the queen his wife, but, besides her, also to marry another." So, then, this idea of two wives did not originate with the pope, as Burnet falsely insinuates, but with master Martin Luther and his coadjutors in reform and iniquity. The gospel-loving and pious Landgrave was touched

with scruples as well as our Henry, and, like him, too, he had the tenderest regard for the character of the woman on whom he might fix his choice, as well as the greatest dread of giving scandal, unless the shield of religion was thrown over their deeds. Here are the Landgrave's words, well worthy of being recorded with the proceedings of the first head of the new church of England:—"But if they apprehend such a certificate may turn to scandal at this time, and prejudice the gospel-cause, should it be printed, I desire at least, they will give me a declaration in writing, that God would not be offended, should I marry in private; and that they will seek for means to make this marriage public in due time; to the end, that the woman I shall wed may not pass for a dishonest person; otherwise, in process of time, the *church* would be scandalized." Then he assures them, that "they need not fear, lest this second marriage should make him injure his first wife, or even separate himself from her, since, on the contrary, he is determined, in this occasion, to carry his cross, and leave his dominions to their common children. Let them, therefore, grant me," continues this prince, "in the name of God, what I request of them; to the end I may both live and die more cheerfully for the gospel-cause, and more willingly undertake the defence of it; and, on my side, I will do whatsoever they shall in reason ask of me, whether they demand THE REVENUES OF MONASTERIES, or other things of the like nature." Rather than lose such a precious disciple in the "gospel-cause," and to avoid having their *new* church scandalized, these evangelical doctors of the Reformation did grant an indulgence, under their hands and seals, to the petitioner to marry another wife, his present one being still living, thus establishing polygamy as a doctrine of the Reformation. This document may be seen at length in Bossuet's Variations.

To place the subject of the divorce in as clear a light as possible, as on this point, we may say, hinged the change of religion in England, and to shew the means resorted to by the adversaries of the queen, to gain the semblance of a

spiritual confirmation of the king's pretended scruples, we will here insert the account given by Dr. Lingard, of these transactions, from his *History of England*. But first, we must observe, that though Crook is represented to have had orders not to make "promises to any till they had freely delivered their opinions." the same delicacy was not preserved towards the nephew of Catharine, as Henry, by his ambassadors, promised the emperor Charles, "the sum of three hundred thousand crowns, the restoration of the marriage portion paid with Catharine, and security for a maintenance suitable to her birth," if he would consent to the divorce. But Charles was inflexible, and told the worthy representatives of Henry, "he was not a merchant, to sell the honour of his aunt. The cause was now before the proper tribunal. If the pope should decide against her, he would be silent; if in her favour, he would support her cause with all the means which God had placed at his disposal." This fact is related by Dr. Lingard, and is extracted from letters written from Bologna, by the bishop of Tarbes, the French ambassador to the English court. Failing in this quarter, he rested his hopes on the decisions of the universities, the success of which plan is thus detailed by Dr. Lingard.

"The new ministers," says that able writer, "condescended to profit by the advice of the man whom they had supplanted; and sought, in conformity with his recommendation, to obtain in favour of the divorce, the opinions of the most learned divines, and most celebrated universities of Europe. Henry pursued the scheme with his characteristic ardour; but, if he was before convinced of the justice of his cause, that conviction must have been shaken by the obstinacy of the opposition which he everywhere experienced. In England it might have been expected that the influence of the crown would silence the partisans of Catharine; yet even in England it was found necessary to employ commands, and promises, and threats, sometimes secret intrigue, and sometimes open violence, before a favorable answer could be extorted from either of the universities.

“ In Italy the king's agents were active and numerous : their success and their failures were perhaps nearly balanced ; but the former was emblazoned to catch the eye of the public, while the latter were discreetly concealed. From the pontiff they had procured a breve, exhorting every man to speak his sentiments without fear or favour ; and, taking their respective stations in the principal cities from Venice to Rome, they distributed, according to their discretion, the moneys which had been remitted to them from England. They drew an ingenious, but in this case not very intelligible, distinction between a fee and a bribe : and contended, that when they rewarded the subscriber for his trouble, they paid him nothing as the price of his subscription. The result of their exertions were the real or pretended answers of the universities of Bologna, Padua, Ferrara, and the subscriptions of some hundreds of individuals.

“ In the Germanic states Henry was less successful. Not one public body could be induced to espouse his cause ; even the reformed divines, with a few exceptions, loudly condemned the divorce ; and Luther himself wrote to Barnes, the royal agent, that he would rather allow the king to have two wives at the same time, than to separate from Catharine for the purpose of marrying another woman.

“ It was, therefore, from France and her fourteen universities, that the most valuable aid was expected. The bishop of Bayonne had been for some months employed in soliciting the votes of the leading members of the different faculties, and Henry had written to the king to employ the royal authority in his favour. But Francis artfully pretended that he dared not risk the offence of Charles, as long as his two sons were detained prisoners in Spain ; nor could they be liberated, according to the treaty, till he had paid two millions of crowns to the emperor, five hundred thousand to the king of England, and had redeemed, in favour of Charles, the lily of diamonds, which Philip of Burgundy had formerly pawned to Henry VII. for the sum of fifty thousand crowns. The impatience of the king swallowed the bait ; he was content



to make every sacrifice, that he might obtain the subscriptions which he sought: he forgave the debt, made a present of the pledge, and added to it a loan of four hundred thousand crowns.

“ Still the business languished till the earl of Wiltshire was returned from Bologna. The university of Paris had long possessed the first place among the learned societies of Europe: and it was deemed of the greatest importance to obtain from it a favourable decision. Henry wrote to the dean with his own hand: Francis commanded the faculty of divinity to deliberate on the subject: Montmorency, his prime minister, canvassed for votes from house to house: and every absent member in the interest of the court was summoned to Paris. Yet the majority was decidedly hostile to the pretensions of the king of England. From the beginning of June to the middle of August they continued to meet and adjourn: and in one instance only, on the second of July, was a plurality of voices obtained, by dexterous management, in favour of Henry. By the order of the court, the bishop of Senlis carried away the register, that the entry might not be effaced or rescinded in any subsequent meeting, and an attested copy was forwarded to England, and published by the king as the real decision of the university of Paris. From Orleans and Toulouse, from the theologians of Bourges, and the civilians of Angers, similar opinions were received: but the theologians of the last city pronounced in favour of the existing marriage. The other universities were not consulted, or their answers were suppressed.

“ It had been originally intended to lay before the pontiff this mass of opinions and subscriptions, as the united voice of the Christian world pronouncing in favour of the divorce. But Clement knew (and Henry was aware that he knew) the arts by which they had been extorted: and both were sensible that, independently of other considerations, they did not reach the real merits of the question: for all of them were founded on the supposition that the marriage between Arthur and Catharine had actually been consummated, a dis-

puted point which the king was unable to prove, and which the queen most solemnly denied. In the place of these opinions it was deemed more prudent to substitute a letter to the pontiff, subscribed by the lords spiritual and temporal, and by a certain number of commoners, in the name of the whole nation. This instrument complains in forcible terms of Clement's partiality and tergiversation. What crime had the king of England committed that he could not obtain what the most learned men, and the most celebrated universities declared to be his right? The kingdom was threatened with the calamities of a disputed succession, which could be avoided only by a lawful marriage; and yet the celebration of that marriage was prevented by the affected delays and unjust partiality of the pontiff. Nothing remained but to apply the remedy without his interference. It might be an evil; but it would prove a less evil, than the precarious and perilous situation in which England was now placed.

“To this uncourteous and menacing remonstrance, Clement replied with temper and firmness: that the charge of partiality would have come with more truth and a better grace from the opposite party; that he had pushed his indulgence for the king beyond the bounds of law and equity, and had refused to act on the queen's appeal, till the whole college of cardinals unanimously charged him with injustice: that, if he had not since proceeded with the cause, it was because Henry had appointed no attorney to plead for him, and because his ambassadors at Bologna had asked for additional time: that the opinions which they mentioned, had never been officially communicated to the holy see, nor did he know of any, which were fortified with reasons and authorities to inform his judgment: that if England were really threatened with a disputed succession, the danger would not be removed, but augmented by proceedings contrary to right and justice: and if lawless remedies were employed, those with whom they originated must answer for the result; that, in short, he was ready to proceed with the cause immediately, and to shew to the king every indulgence and favour compatible with justice: one

thing only he begged in return, that, they would not require of him, through gratitude to man, to violate the immutable commandments of God."

This account differs very widely from that given by Burnet, and is more entitled to credit, not only from its carrying the air of probability and sincerity, but because the historian has given the sources from whence they are derived. Thus, then, we see that the king's agents were encouraged to employ every species of art and chicanery to settle the scruples of the conscientious Henry, while on the other hand, the holy father was solely intent on doing justice where justice was due, and preventing the injured party, as far as he could, from being oppressed. The sovereign pontiff had a conscience to satisfy, without being disturbed by the violence of criminal passions like Harry, and therefore his mind was influenced with a desire to see the commandments of God fulfilled and not violated. When Harry found his case so hopeless, he himself felt a desire to submit to the difficulties opposed to him; but this disposition was no sooner discovered than Anne Boleyn and her friends took the alarm, and she was instructed to play off all her arts to win the king from this inclination to become just. The ruin of the ministry, all Anne's creatures, was predicted, when Cromwell, who had been raised into some note by the means of Wolsey, stepped forward and rescued them from the danger by which they were threatened. Of this man we shall have to say more hereafter, when we come to the dissolution of the monasteries; we shall therefore dismiss him for the present, that we may not break in upon the narrative of the divorce.

During the whole of these discussions, Catharine remained steady to her resolution of leaving the question in the pope's hands; every artifice was used to persuade her to consent to a separation, but to no purpose. "Several lords," writes Dr. Lingard, "were deputed to wait on the queen, and to request that for the king's conscience, she would refer the matter to four temporal and four spiritual peers. 'God grant him a quiet conscience,' she replied, 'but this shall be your

answer: I am his wife, lawfully married to him by order of holy church; and so I will abide until the court of Rome, which was privy at the beginning, shall have made an end thereof.' A second deputation was sent, with an order for her to leave the palace at Windsor. 'Go where I may,' she answered, 'I shall still be his lawful wife.' From that day (July 15, 1531) they never more saw each other. She repaired to the Moor, thence to Easthamstead, and at last fixed her residence at Ampthill." Though Harry had banished the queen from his presence, he still craved the authority of the pope to dissolve the contract, and the cause was urged at Rome by the king's agents with much assiduity. In the mean time, queen Catharine wrote to the holy father, announcing her formal expulsion from the king's presence, and praying justice at his hands. Clement could no longer refuse to listen to the prayers of an injured and defenceless woman: he wrote to Henry a moving letter, in which he painted the infamy of his proceedings; that having married a most virtuous princess, with whom he had lived in conjugal happiness for twenty years, he now drove her from his court to cohabit with another woman. He therefore exhorted the king to recall his injured queen, and dismiss the wanton who had supplanted her. But Harry's conscience, we suppose, was now seared, for instead of listening to the admonitions of the holy father, he began to shew symptoms of disobedience to that authority which he had hitherto pronounced as lawful. The clergy had already been placed in *præmunire*, and now they were forbidden to make constitutions, although such had been their imprescriptible right, in faith and morals, from the first foundation of the church. These things being reported at Rome, Clement pronounced against the claim, and issued a breve complaining that the king, in defiance of public decency, continued to cohabit with his mistress. We must here leave the unfortunate Catharine, to bring before the reader her supplanter.

## THE KING MARRIES ANNE BOLEYN.

We now return to the *Book of Martyrs*, where we find the following account detailed under the above head:—"Soon after this, the king married Anne Boleyn; Rowland Lee (afterwards bishop of Coventry and Lichfield) officiated, none being present but the duke of Norfolk, and her father, mother, brother, and Cranmer. It was *thought* that the former marriage being *null*, the king *might proceed to another*; and *perhaps*, they *hoped*, that as the *pope* had formerly *proposed this method*, so he would *now approve* of it. But though the *pope* had joined himself to France, yet he was still so much in *fear* of the emperor, that he dared not provoke him. A new citation was therefore issued out, for the king to answer to the queen's complaints; but Harry's agents protested, that their master was a sovereign prince, and England a *free church*, over which *the pope had no authority*; and that the king could expect no justice at Rome, where the emperor's power was so great."

This is Burnet's story, and the excuse he makes for the actors in the scene is, that they *thought* and *hoped*, that the *pope* would be found as kind as Luther and Co., and grant the scrupulous Harry leave to have *two* wives at once. From this account it is clear the marriage with Anne could not be *lawful*, because no one had pronounced formally against the marriage with Catharine, which, for decency sake, we think should have been done. The day on which Anne was married to the king was the 25th of January, 1533, five years after the scruples of Harry's conscience began to work, three of which he scrupulously spent in adultery with Anne; nor is it likely he would have married her so soon, had she not proved to be in a condition to give him hopes of an heir. In the September preceding he had created her marchioness of Pembroke, and settled upon her a yearly pension of one thousand pounds, out of the ecclesiastical revenue of the bishopric of Durham; so that this lady, who is looked upon as a prime Protestant *saint*, commenced her career by robbing



a virtuous woman of the affections of her husband, and the church of her property. Well, the pious couple were tacked together by Dr. Lee, but not till the king had told him a lie ; for when Lee discovered the object of the king, he demurred, having his scruples as well as the royal bridegroom, and it was not till the king told him that the pope had pronounced in his favour, and that the instrument was safely deposited in his closet, that Lee consented to perform the ceremony. For his compliance the celebrant was made bishop of Chester, was afterwards translated to Lichfield and Coventry, and honoured with the presidentship of Wales. This marriage of Harry, if such it can be called, for though the rites were performed, it could not be legal, being in defiance of both law and justice, and unauthorized by either church or state ; this marriage may be considered the foundation stone of that church, which was afterwards established by law, and is now mainly supported by proscriptive tests and penal codes. Burnet insinuates that the pope was influenced in his conduct, in this dispute about matrimonial rights, between Harry and Catharine, by his fears of the emperor, but there is not a shadow of pretence to bear him out ; on the contrary, the testimony preserved shews that Clement did not wish to meddle with the matter, but desired to see it decided without his interference ; yet, when compelled to pronounce his judgment, no other motive appeared to influence him, than that of discharging his duty to God and his conscience, by doing justice to injured innocence, according to the canons of the church. The power of the emperor was not greater at Rome, when Harry went through the mock ceremony of marrying Anne Boleyn, than when she was living with him as his mistress, and he was seeking, by every disreputable means that could be contrived and put in practice by his corrupt agents, to obtain a favourable decision on his side ; and it was only when his case became hopeless, that his pride was aroused, and his mercenary disposition set on fire. Then it was, and not till then, the monster threw off the mask of hypocrisy, banished all his scruples, and proclaimed himself head of a *new*, but

not "a free," church. Till Harry assumed the supremacy of the church of England, as well as the state, the church might strictly be termed "free," as the ministers had immunities secured to them by Magna Charta, and her doctrine and discipline were not at the nod or caprice of a lecherous old man, a feeble child, or a cold-blooded lascivious woman. The church was then secured in her faith by the promises of God, in her morality by the exemplary lives of her most eminent ministers, and the king, the nobles, the gentry, and people, all bowed submission to her decrees, as emanating from the Spirit of Truth, which was to be her guide, till the consummation of the world. This was indeed "a free" church, because she was not controlled by the will of man, nor by any set of men, but by the omnipotent will of God, who is the Author of justice, virtue, and freedom. Now, however, a new church was to be formed, under the direction of one of the most consummate hypocrites, as we have proved, and the most inexorable tyrants that ever wore a crown, as we shall have to shew; and the creed of this church was not to rest on the word of God, but on the enactments of a lay parliament. So that, as we shall see by and by, the symbols of faith were as variable as the wind, and were *changed* as often as it suited the taste of the head of the church and his wise counsellors. Before, however, we enter on the bloody deeds of Henry, we will here give an outline of the doctrine of supremacy, for adhering to which, bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More, two of the most virtuous and learned men of the age, and many other characters of great eminence and learning, suffered martyrdom and the Catholics of the present day are debarred from exercising those civil immunities granted to the people of this country by the constitution.

#### THE SUPREMACY.

Burnet gives us in his Abridgment the following "ARGUMENTS FOR REJECTING THE POPE'S POWER," which the modern editors have inserted in their edition of the *Book of Martyrs*. He says;—"In England the foundations

on which the papal authority was built, had been examined with extraordinary care of late years; and several books were written on that subject. It was demonstrated that all the apostles were made equal in the powers that Christ gave them, and he often condemned their contests about superiority, but never declared in St. Peter's favour. St. Paul withstood him to his face, and reckoned himself not inferior to him. If the dignity of a person left any authority with the city in which he sat, then Antioch must carry it as well as Rome; and Jerusalem, where Christ suffered, was to be preferred to all the world, for it was truly the mother church. The other privileges ascribed to St. Peter, were either only a precedence of order, or were occasioned by his fall, as that injunction, 'Feed my sheep,' being a restoring him to the apostolical function. St. Peter had also a limited province, the circumcision, as St. Paul had the uncircumcision, of far greater extent; which shewed that Peter was not considered as the universal pastor.

"Several sees, as Ravenna, Milan, and Aquileia, pretended exemption from the papal authority. Many English bishops had asserted that the popes had no authority against the canons, and to that day no canon the pope made was binding till it was received; which shewed the pope's authority was not believed to be founded on a divine authority: and the contests which the kings of England had had with the popes concerning investitures, bishops doing homage, appeals to Rome, and the authority of papal bulls and provisions, shewed that the pope's power was believed to be subject to laws and custom, and so not derived from Christ and St. Peter; and as laws had given them some power, and princes had been forced in ignorant ages to submit to their usurpations, so they might, as they saw cause, change those laws and resume their rights.

"The next point inquired into was the authority that kings had in matters of religion and the church. In the New Testament, Christ was himself subject to the civil powers, and charged his disciples not to affect temporal

dominion. They also wrote to the churches to be subject to the higher powers, and call them supreme, and charge every soul to be subject to them: so in scripture the king is called head and supreme, and every soul is said to be under him, which, joined together, makes up this conclusion, that he is the supreme head over all persons. In the primitive church the bishops only made rules or canons, but pretended to no compulsive authority, but what came from the civil magistrate. Upon the whole matter they concluded that the pope had no power in England, and that the king had an entire dominion over all his subjects, which extended even to the regulation of ecclesiastical matters.

“These questions being fully discussed in many disputes, and published in several books, all the bishops, abbots, and friars of England, Fisher only excepted, were so far satisfied with them, that they resolved to comply with the changes the king was resolved to make.”

Such is the account which Burnet gives, and it was certainly his interest, who held his prelacy from the king, not by divine authority, to make the people believe what he told them, and unfortunately for the cause of truth, they have too long given credit to his and such like assertions. “The foundations on which the papal authority was built,” we are told, “had been examined with extraordinary care of late years; and several books were written on that subject.” But, we ask, by *whom*? And *what* were the *titles* of these books? The foundation of the papal authority in England was never disputed till Henry had resolved on parting with his lawful wife Catharine, and the pope had determined not to consent to his iniquitous desires. The supremacy of the bishop of Rome was a doctrine received with the Christian faith in England, as it was in all other countries that embraced Christianity, and it is still held by every Catholic nation and people in the world. There might have been books written on the foundation of claims set up by some of the popes, regarding the temporalities of the church, but these claims on the one part, and objections to them on the other, by

no means affected the *divine right* of the pope to preside over and guide the church of God, as her visible head on earth. Burnet says, "It was demonstrated that all the apostles were *made equal* in the powers that Christ gave them, and he often condemned their contests about superiority, but never declared in St. Peter's favour." In their ministerial functions, the apostles certainly were made equal, and so are all Catholic bishops now in their respective dioceses, but Peter received a charge from his divine Master which no other apostle did, and consequently that *was* a declaration in his favour. The charge to feed Christ's lambs and sheep was given to Peter, and to Peter *only*, in the presence of the other apostles; but all of them were empowered to preach the word, to offer sacrifice, and to forgive sins. To Peter, too, and to Peter *alone*, were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the promise that the church should be built upon him as upon a rock.—(Matt. xvi. 17, 18, 19.) In the Protestant version of the bible, we find St. Matthew, in the 10th chapter and 2nd verse of his gospel, expressly naming St. Peter as the FIRST apostle, and we also find in the scriptures, that Peter was the *first* to confess his faith in Christ, (Matt. xvi. 16.); the *first* to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection, (Luke xxiv. 34.); the *first* to preach the faith of Christ to the people, (Acts ii. 14.); the *first* to convert the Jews, (*ibid.* 37.); and the *first* to receive the Gentiles, (*ibid.* x. 17.) With what face, then, could a bishop, whose church is said to be founded on scripture, make such an assertion, that Christ never declared in favour of Peter. Can any circumstance be more clear and explicit than scripture, on this question of pre-eminence, in favour of St. Peter? As we before said, the Catholic bishops are equal in power in their respective dioceses, but the successor of the first bishop of Rome (St. Peter) inherited from him the superintendence, or jurisdiction, over the whole flock, for the purpose of preserving unity.

St. Paul, it is said, withstood him to his face; but he did not doubt St. Peter's right to the supremacy, though he



might differ from him as to an *opinion* which Peter might have held. It is one thing to dissent from an opinion merely human, and another to reject a divine command. There is no law in the church to prevent an inferior from finding fault with a superior, provided it is done with due respect and deference, and this is one of the means by which the faith is preserved pure and entire, under the control of the Holy Spirit; for as all the clergy are human, and are, therefore, liable to fall individually, so, when a departure from truth, or an erroneous opinion is started, it becomes the duty of every man to detect the innovation, and caution the believers against it. It is also a proof that there is a pure system of liberty in the Catholic church, since the pope, though he is *head* of it, is obliged to govern according to the laws, and is not exempt from the censure of his brethren, any more than St. Peter was from the reproach of St. Paul. An instance of this occurred in the year 1331-2, when Pope John XXII. preached a doctrine from the pulpit in Avignon, then the residence of the popes, that was novel in the church. His doctrine was instantly, and as openly, denounced by an English Dominican, named Wales. The friar was imprisoned for his laudable courage and zeal, but a crowd of divines aided and supported him, and he was released, while the pope explained and retracted what he had advanced. It is said, the holy father was written to by the then king of France, in this laconic style:—"Retract, or I will have you burned." St. Cyprian, St. Augustin, and St. Gregory did not consider the opposition of St. Paul, here alluded to, any prejudice to the authority of St. Peter, but, on the contrary, they gave entire submission to the see of Rome, as pre-eminent in dignity, and supreme over the whole flock.

Another objection started is, that "If the dignity of a person left any authority with the city in which he sat, then Antioch must carry it as well as Rome; and Jerusalem, where Christ suffered, was to be preferred to all the world, for it was truly the mother church." To this we answer, that wherever St. Peter went, he still preserved his supremacy.

At Jerusalem he presided at the council held there, as related in the Acts of the Apostles, and pronounced the decision of the members, but he was not bishop of that city. St. James was the first bishop of Jerusalem. St. Peter established the see of Antioch, and appointed a successor, from whence he went to Rome, and there fixed the seat of supremacy, where it has unalterably remained to the present day. That this supremacy was to be centred in the Roman pontiff by divine power is clearly manifest, by the immutability of succession, which no other see, we believe, can boast. The sees established by all the other apostles, and even that of Antioch, have been dissevered in their succession; but Rome, the eternal city, notwithstanding the revolutions she has undergone in her temporal concerns and governments, has been the centre of unity of the church of Christ, and will so remain to the end of time; a glorious monument of the unerring word of God, who assured us that his church, founded on a ROCK, should withstand every assault of the world and the devil.

It is also contended that St. Peter had a limited province, "the circumcision, as St. Paul had the uncircumcision, of a far greater extent; which shewed that Peter was not considered as the *universal* pastor." In opposition to this statement, we shall produce a host of witnesses, who had better means of knowing whether St. Peter's mission was limited, than Gilbert Burnet, the Protestant bishop of Sarum. It is really amusing to see the miserable shifts to which the impugnors of the pope's supremacy are driven to prop up their cause; for, in one place, we see them contending that all the apostles were equal, though, as we have shewn from scripture, Christ gave more than one command and promise to Peter *expressly*; and, in another, we have his commission to preach limited, though, in conferring this power, Christ spoke to them all in general terms. Besides, St. Peter had his commission given to him long before St. Paul was called to the ministry, and received the Gentiles in the person of the centurion, before the latter began to preach.

We have given, in the first volume of this work, the sentiments of St. Cyprian, St. Basil, and St. Gregory Nazianzen, on the supremacy of the pope; we will here add a few other testimonies from the first ages, to shew that on this doctrine, as well as on all others believed by the Catholic church, there was no variation. To begin, then, with St. Leo. He calls Rome the head of the Christian world, and adds that that name is properly hers by reason of the chair of St. Peter, and that Rome extends its authority further by the sacred rights of religion, than by those of temporal government.—*Serm. de Ratio. Apost. edit. Quenal* p. 164.

St. Optatus says, that the first mark of the true church, is to communicate with the chair of St. Peter.—*Lib. 2. contra Parmen. edit. Dupin.* p. 91.

St. Prosper says the same as St. Leo.—*Lib. de Ingratis, ed. Fraisi. Novo.* p. 119.

St. Chrysostom writes to pope Innocent I., begging him to annul all that had been done against him in a synod, where Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, presided; and to demand justice against his false accusers.—*Ep. 1. ad Inno. t. 2. con. Lab.* 1300.

Now, as to the four first councils, and first as to that of Nice, it is evident that Osius, bishop of Cordova, and Vitus and Vincentius, priests of the church of Rome, presided over it, in the place, and by the appointment, of pope Sylvester, as Gelasius, who lived more than twelve hundred years ago, has left written.—*Synb. con. Uriæ. l. 2, cap. 5.*

Eusebius, l. 7. c. 30, tells us that Paul of Samosata, having been condemned by the second council of Antioch, he would not resign the episcopal palace to him who was chosen in his place, but the emperor Aurelian, though a Pagan, adjusted it to him to whom the pope gave his communion.

Socrates, the historian, writes, that the holy canons forbid anything to be decided in the church, without the consent of the pope.—*Lib. 2. c. 8, edit. Froben,* p. 296.

Sozomen relates, that St. Athanasius, being deposed by Eusebius of Nicomedia, in the council of Antioch, appealed

to Rome, and was by the pope reinstated; the chief care of all things, says the historian, belonging to him by the dignity of his chair.—*Lib. 3, c. 8.*

Theodoret maintains, that the mighty number of bishops who assembled at Rimini, no ways prejudiced the good cause, because the pope, whose advice, says he, ought in the first place to be taken, did not consent to what was transacted there.—*Lib. 2, c. 22, edit. Froben. p. 462.*

Evagrius assures us, that the fathers of the Council of Ephesus, being on the point to judge Nestorius, said they were assembled in obedience to the canons, and pope Celestine's letter.—*Lib. 1, c. 4, edit. Froben p. 726*

Such a host of witnesses in favour of the supremacy of St. Peter, and his successors, the bishops of Rome, ought, we think, to be sufficiently convincing; but lest there be some of the present generation sceptically inclined, we will introduce two of the most celebrated characters of the Reformation, so called, to speak to the article impugned. These are the no less important personages than LUTHER and HENRY. The former, in his letters to the pope before his condemnation, writes with all submission and acknowledgment of the right, power, and supreme authority of the see of Rome. In his letter to pope Leo X., dated on Trinity Sunday, 1518, he says, that he cast himself at his feet, that it belonged to him *alone* to condemn him or absolve him, that he abandoned both himself and his cause to the holy father, resolving to receive his decision as coming from *the mouth of Christ*; and in another letter to the same pope, dated the 3rd of May, the year following, he acknowledges the church of Rome to be superior to all. Such were the sentiments of Luther, before he threw off the spiritual obedience he acknowledged in the pope, and before that authority pronounced upon his conduct; but when he found himself condemned, and required to retract his erroneous opinions, he then became furious, set up his own *ipse dixit* against the recorded testimony of ages, and in renouncing all rule of authority, he became a slave to the vilest passions of human nature. It

was this conduct on the part of Luther which called Henry forth to break a lance with him in the field of controversy ; and thus spoke the royal author in reference to the pope's authority, in his Defence of the Seven Sacraments against Luther :—" I will not wrong the bishop of Rome so much, as troublesomely, or carefully to dispute his right, as if it were a matter doubtful ; it is sufficient for my present task, that the enemy is much led by fury, that he destroys his own credit, and makes clearly appear, that by mere malice he is so blinded, that he neither sees, nor knows what he says himself. For he cannot deny, but that all the faithful honour and acknowledge the sacred Roman see for their mother and supreme, nor does distance of place or dangers in the way hinder access thereunto. For if those who come hither from the Indies tell us truth, the Indians themselves (separated from us by such a vast distance, both of land and sea,) do submit to the see of Rome. If the bishop of Rome has got this large power neither by command of God nor the will of man, but by main force, I would fain know of Luther, when the pope rushed into possession of so great riches ? for so vast a power (especially if it begun in the memory of man), cannot have an obscure origin. But perhaps he will say, it is above one or two ages since ; let him then point out the time by histories ; otherwise, if it be so ancient that the beginning of so great a thing is quite forgot ; let him know, that, by all laws, we are forbidden to think otherwise, than that thing had a lawful beginning, which so far surpasses the memory of man, that its origin cannot be known. It is certain that, by the unanimous consent of all nations, it is forbidden to change, or move the things which have been for a long time immoveable. Truly, if any will look upon ancient monuments, or read the histories of former times, he may easily find, that since the conversion of the world, all churches in the Christian world have been obedient to the see of Rome. We find that, though the empire was translated to the Grecians, yet did they still own, and obey the supremacy of the church and see of Rome, except they were in any turbulent schism.



“ When Luther so impudently asserts, (and that against his former sentence,) ‘ That the pope has no kind of right over the Catholic church ; no, not so much as human ; but has by mere force tyrannically usurped it ; I cannot but admire, that he should expect his readers should be so easily induced to believe his words ; or so blockish, as to think that a priest, without any weapon, or company to defend him, (as doubtless he was, before he enjoyed that which Luther says he usurped), could ever expect or hope, without any right or title, to obtain so great a command over so many bishops, his fellows, in so many different and divers nations.

“ How could he expect, I say, that any body would believe, (as I know not how he could desire they should,) that all nations, cities, nay kingdoms and provinces, should be so prodigal of their rights and liberties, as to acknowledge the superiority of a strange priest, to whom they should owe no subjection ? But what signifies it to know the opinion of Luther in this case, when (through anger and malice) he himself is ignorant of his own opinion, or what he thinks ? but he manifestly discovers the darkness of his understanding and knowledge, and the folly and blindness of his heart, abandoned to a reprobate sense, in doing and saying things so inconsistent. How true is that saying of the apostle ! ‘ Though I have prophecy, and understand all mysteries and knowledge ; and though I have all faith so as to remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.’ Of which charity Luther not only shews how void he is, by perishing himself through fury, but much more by endeavouring to draw all others with him into destruction, whilst he strives to dissuade them from their obedience to the chief bishop, whom, in a three-fold manner, he himself is bound to obey, viz. as a Christian, as a priest, and as a religious brother ; his disobedience deserving to be punished in a treble manner : he remembers not how much obedience is better than sacrifice ; nor does he consider how it is ordained in *Deuteronomy*, ‘ That the man who will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest, (that stands to minister there before

the Lord thy God.) or unto the judge, even that man shall die.' He considers not, I say, what cruel punishment he deserves, that will not obey the chief priest and supreme judge upon earth. For this poor brother, being cited to appear before the pope, with offers to pay his expenses, and promise of safe conduct, he refuses to go without a guard; troubling the whole church as much as he could, and exciting the whole body against the head; which to do, is the sin of witchcraft; and in whom to acquiesce, is as the sin of idolatry. Seeing therefore, that Luther, (moved by hatred), runs head-long on to destruction, and refuses to submit to the law of God, but desires to establish a law of his own, 'It behoves all Christians to beware, lest (as the apostle says) through the disobedience of one, many be made sinners;' but on the contrary, by hating and detesting his wickedness, we may sing with the prophet, 'I hated the wicked, and loved your law.'"

Having thus established beyond the power of contradiction the divine right of supremacy in spiritual matters in the pope, we will now proceed to examine the next point which Burnet says was inquired into, namely, "the authority that kings had in matters of religion and the church." He also states that, "Christ was himself subject to the civil powers, and charged his disciples not to affect temporal dominion." Admitted; and such is the doctrine of the Catholic church at this moment. The pope himself, when a subject of the Roman emperors, like his divine Master, was subject to the civil power, but he nevertheless exercised that spiritual authority which was committed to him by that same Master, to rule and govern the kingdom He came on earth to establish, which was to embrace every form of temporal government, and every nation in every clime that chose to submit to the law preached unto them. This law, as it related to the next world, made no distinction between the king and the peasant, the pontiff and the friar; all were alike subject to its operations, and the ministers of this law were independent of the temporal governments in the exercise of their spiritual functions. Their

commission was received from God, and they were amenable to God and his church only for the due performance of their sacred duties. But let it not be understood that we are contending that the clergy owed no obedience to the supreme temporal government under which they lived. As subjects of the state, whether monarchical or democratical—an absolute or limited monarchy, or a republic—they were bound to yield allegiance to the civil laws of that state, and inculcate the duty of obedience to their flocks. Thus, the allegiance of the Catholic clergy and people is not divided, as is unjustly represented by that portion of the established clergy which is opposed to the claims of the Catholic laity of this kingdom to be admitted to those civil immunities which unjust laws have wrested from them; but it may be said to be more firmly grounded than that of other religious denominations, because it springs from the essence of Truth, and is engrafted on the pillars of Justice. This question of the supremacy, we see by the public papers, has been agitated in the House of Lords by the bishop of Chester, (Dr. Blomfield), and it was some time ago objected against the Catholics, by the bishop of Peterborough, (Dr. Herbert Marsh), that they could not be good subjects because their *allegiance* was divided. If this objection have any foundation, then were our Catholic ancestors but half subjects to their sovereigns; yet the page of history informs us that these ancestors were able, though the ages they lived in are described by the modern editors as “*dark*,” to discern the extent of the pope’s supremacy, and to interpose their weight in favour of the rights of their kings, whenever an ambitious pontiff in the chair of Peter presumed to encroach upon them. We have many instances in the statute book of barriers to prevent the privileges of the English church from being invaded, but we need not insert them here. The prelates uncandidly confound the *allegiance* Catholics owe and render to the sovereign power of the state, whether vested in a chief magistrate or a council, and the *obedience* they owe to the head of the universal church. In the first case they give implicit

fealty as subjects, in the second submission as children to the head of one family. While they refuse to admit the right of the chief magistrate of the state to rule in the church of God, they at the same time deny any right on the part of the supreme head of that church to interfere in the temporal affairs of independent states. Such were the allegiance and obedience rendered to the supreme powers in Catholic times, when the martial prowess of England was renowned through the world, and her people the happiest in existence; nor could they give any other without flying in the face of the solemn injunctions of their God.

Burnet says the *king* is called *head* and *supreme* in scripture, and every soul is said to be under him, which, *joined together*, makes up this conclusion, that he is the *supreme head* over *all* persons. Who but must smile at the logic of this prelatie historian? In what part of scripture is the *king* called the “head and supreme?” When the Jews sent persons to tempt our blessed Saviour on the point of subjection to the Roman power, what was his answer?—“Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” Or, in other words, render to the temporal power, of whatever kind soever it may be, the duty of good subjects; and at the same time render to the church, which I am about to establish on earth, to be a light to all generations to lead them to heaven, that obedience which she may exact in my name. Thus SS. Peter and John, when they were desired by the synagogue to desist from preaching Christ crucified, refused to submit, observing they must obey God rather than men. So, when Henry and Elizabeth assumed the supremacy in spirituals as well as temporals, and commanded all to obey their dictates, the Catholics, following the example of the two apostles, refused to acknowledge the new spiritual supremacy, and many of them sealed the refusal with their blood, and all suffered penalties and proscriptions for thus following the divine injunctions of their God. In the Jewish theocracy the two authorities were separated, and when kings were appointed they were not allowed to in-

terfere in the rites of religion, God having selected the high priest for that purpose. In the New Testament we see nothing about kings being "head and supreme;" and St. Paul, in his injunctions to the Romans, speaks not of the *emperor* as being supreme, but of the *power*, the thing itself, as coming from God. But if the scripture be so clear on this point, and conferred the *supremacy* on the king by *divine right*, how did it happen that Henry, when he coveted the title, applied to *parliament* to confer that *honour* upon him? We know that Cranmer—the double-faced hypocritical villain, Cranmer—composed a book to establish the divine right of kings; but Henry was not so ignorant of the constitution of the country as to ground his title on Cranmer's opinion; so far from it, he was sensible that unless he had the sanction of his parliament, his claim would have the appearance of being illegal. By the power of parliament then, and not by scripture, was the supremacy of the Church of England conferred on Henry the Eighth, and by the same authority is it now held.

It is also contended, that "in the primitive church the bishops only made rules or canons, but pretended to no compulsive authority but what came from the civil magistrate;" and therefore, Burnet says, "upon the whole of the matter, they concluded that the pope had *no power* in England, and that the king had an *entire dominion* over *all* his subjects, which extended even to the regulation of *ecclesiastical matters*." This conclusion shews that those who thus decided, paid as little regard to the principles of the civil constitution of England, as they did to the divine rights of the church of God. Sir Thomas More, however, who refused to admit this power in the king, and was a true Catholic and sound lawyer, pronounced this conclusion to be illegal and unconstitutional. Our constitution knows of no "entire dominion" in the king "over all his subjects," nor of any *absolute supreme power* immediately under God, in *any sense whatsoever*, independently of parliament. This made the venerable and learned More, who professed to have studied the subject as a lawyer with intense application for the last seven



years of his life, say, "that a parliament can make a king and may depose him, and that every parliament man may give his consent thereto, but that the subject cannot be bound so in the case of supremacy." (*See State Trials.*) Hence it is clear that Henry, being dependent on his parliament, according to the principles of the constitution, could not take upon himself his new title without being authorized by parliament; consequently it was a parliamentary grant and not a divine right.

We allow that the primitive bishops pretended to no compulsive authority, but what came from the civil magistrate; nor can the Catholic church ever claim such power, because it was never given to her; hence we ground our position, THAT PERSECUTION NEVER WAS A PRINCIPLE OF CATHOLIC FAITH OR DISCIPLINE. The church of England, however, in her 37th article, seems to have made *compulsive* authority a question of faith. It is laid down in that article, that power is given by God in the scriptures "to godly princes to restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers;" and on this supposition did Harry and Elizabeth get laws passed, making matter of conscience acts of high treason, and butchered their subjects without mercy for not conforming to their capricious creeds. It may not be amiss to relate here the means adopted by Henry to obtain an acknowledgment of his supreme headship in spiritual affairs. While the question of separation from Catharine was going on at Rome, Harry contrived to get the clergy into a *præmunire* for admitting Wolsey's legatine power, though it was done by the king's privity, if not with his consent. By this step their persons became liable to imprisonment, and their estates to confiscation, so that he got them completely into his power; and as few of them were endued with the desire of martyrdom, they basely and cowardly submitted to the monarch's wishes, and agreed to allow him his demands, which were, that no constitution or ordinance should thenceforth be enacted, promulgated, or put in execution by the clergy, unless the king's highness approved of it. This took place in 1532.

He next tried the council, where a debate was held, whether it were convenient for the king to assume to himself the supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs? In opposition to this question the following speech is put down in Lord Herbert's History. "Your highness is come to a point which needs a strong and firm resolution; it being not only the most important in itself, that can be presented, but likewise of that consequence that it will comprehend your kingdom and posterity. It is, whether in this business of your divorce and second marriage, as well as in all other ecclesiastical affairs, in your dominions, you would make use of your own or the pope's authority. For my own part, as an Englishman, and your highness's subject, I must wish all power in your highness. But when I consider the ancient practice of this kingdom, I cannot but think any innovation dangerous. For, if in every temporal estate, it be necessary to come to some supreme authority, whence all inferior magistracy should be derived; it seems much more necessary in religion, both as the body thereof seems more susceptible of a head, than any else; and, as that head again, must direct so many others. We should, therefore, above all things, labour to keep an unity in the parts thereof, as being the sacred bond which knits and holds together, not its own only, but all other government. But how much, sir, should we recede from the dignity thereof, if we, at once, retrenched this its chief and most eminent part? And who ever liked that body long whose head was taken away? Certainly, sir, an authority received for many ages ought not rashly to be rejected. For is not the pope *communis pater*, in the Christian world, and arbiter of their differences? Does not he support the majesty of religion, and vindicate it from neglect? Does not the holding his authority from God keep men in awe, not of temporal alone, but eternal punishments; and therein extend his power beyond death itself? And will it be secure to lay aside those potent means of reducing people to their duty, and trust only to the sword of justice and secular arms? Besides, who shall mitigate the rigour of laws in those cases,

which may admit exception, if the pope be taken away? Who shall presume to give orders, or administer the sacraments of the church? Who shall be depositary of the oaths and leagues of princes? Or fulminate against the perjured infractors of them? For my part (as affairs now stand), I find not, how, either a general peace amongst princes, or any equal moderation in human affairs, can be well conserved without him. For, as his court is a kind of chancery to all other courts of justice in the Christian world; so if you take it away, you subvert that equity and conscience which should be the rule and interpreter of all laws and constitutions whatsoever. I will conclude, that I wish your highness (as my king and sovereign) all true greatness and happiness; but think it not fit, in this case, that your subjects should either examine by what right ecclesiastical government is innovated; or enquire how far they are bound thereby; since, beside that it might cause division, and hazard the overthrow both of the one and the other authority, it would give that offence and scandal abroad, that foreign princes would both reprove and disallow all our proceedings in this kind, and, upon occasion, be disposed easily to join against us."

Notwithstanding these excellent sentiments, which clearly shewed the existence, utility, and necessity of a spiritual supremacy, to set bounds to the ambition and violations of unjust sovereigns, Henry packed a parliament in the year 1534, which passed an act setting forth, "That albeit, the king was supreme head of the church of England, and had been so recognized by the clergy of this realm in their convocation; yet, for more corroboration thereof, as also for extirpating all errors, heresies, and abuses of the same, it was enacted, that the king, his heirs and successors, kings of England, should be accepted and reputed the supreme head on earth of the church of England, and have and enjoy, united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof as all honours, dignities, pre-eminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits and commodities, to the said dignity of supreme head

of the same church belonging or appertaining. And that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority, from time to time, to visit and repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of the realm: any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign prescription, or any thing or things to the contrary thereof notwithstanding."

Burnet would further persuade us that the clergy were unanimous in acknowledging the right of the king to the supremacy, bishop Fisher only excepted. This is a presumptuous falsehood, and is contradicted by the records of history. Sir Thomas More suffered death for no other cause than denying the supremacy of the king in matters of religion. He, as we have before said, spent much time in studying the question, and there cannot be a doubt but that he examined the books published on both sides, and particularly those in favour of Henry's claim, which Burnet represents to have had the powerful effect of converting "*all the bishops, abbots, and friars of England, Fisher only excepted,*" to the king's side. Now what was the result of More's search? On receiving sentence of death, he thus addressed the court: "Well, seeing that I am condemned, God knows how justly, I will speak freely for the disburthening my conscience what I think of this law. When I perceived it was the king's pleasure to sift out from whence the pope's authority was derived, I confess, I studied seven years together to find out the truth of it, and I could not meet with the works of any one doctor, approved by the church, that avouch a layman was or ever could be the head of the church." And when the chancellor replied: "Would you be

esteemed wiser or to have a sincerer conscience than all the bishops, learned doctors, nobility and commons of the realm?" Sir Thomas answered: "I am able to produce against one bishop, which you can produce on your side, a hundred holy and Catholic bishops for my opinion, and against one realm the custom of all Christendom." Bishop Fisher held the same sentiments, as we find recorded in his life by Dr. Bailey. After sentence of death had been passed upon him, the prelate thus delivered himself to the judges:—"My lords, I am here condemned before you of high treason, for denial of the king's supremacy over the church of England; but by what order of justice I leave to God, who is the searcher both of the king's majesty's conscience and yours. Nevertheless, being found guilty (as it is termed) I am, and must be, contented with all that God shall send; to whose will I wholly refer and submit myself. And now to tell you more plainly my mind touching this matter of the king's supremacy, I think indeed, and always have thought, and do now lastly affirm, that his grace cannot justly claim any such supremacy over the church of God, as he now taketh upon him; neither hath it ever been seen or heard of, that any temporal prince, before his days, hath presumed to that dignity: whereof, if the king will now adventure himself in proceeding in this strange and unwonted case, no doubt but he shall deeply incur the grievous displeasure of Almighty God, to the great damage of his own soul, and of many others, and to the utter ruin of this realm, committed to his charge; whereof will ensue some sharp punishment at his hand: wherefore, I pray God, his grace may remember himself in time, and hearken to good counsel, for the preservation of himself and his realm, and the quietness of all Christendom."

To shew how little reliance is to be placed on Burnet, and the total disregard he shewed for truth, when writing his *History of the Reformation*, we will here insert some collections from Stow, of the sufferers for denying the supremacy of the king, beside the above mentioned illustrious characters.



The reader will then be able to judge whether "all the bishops, abbots, and friars of England, Fisher only excepted, were so far satisfied with them, that they resolved to comply with the changes the king was resolved to make;" and also of the bloody means that were put in execution to make them satisfied with these changes.

Sir William Peterson, priest, late commissary of Calais, and Sir William Richardson, priest of St. Mary's in Calais, were both there hanged, drawn, and quartered, in the market-place, for the supremacy. p. 579.

Dr. Wilson, and Dr. Samson, bishop of Chichester, were sent to the Tower for relieving certain prisoners who had refused to subscribe to the king's supremacy. And for the same offence Richard Farmer, grocer of London, a rich and wealthy citizen, was committed to the Marshalsea, and after arraigned, and attainted in a *præmunire*, and lost all his goods; his wife and children thrust out of doors. p. 580.

Robert Barns, D.D., Thomas Gerrard, parson of Honey-lane, and William Jerom, vicar of Stepney-heath, batchelors in divinity; also Edward Powel, Thomas Able, and Richard Fetherston, all three doctors, were drawn from the Tower of London to West Smithfield. The three first were drawn to a stake, and there burnt: the other three were drawn to a gallows, and there hanged, beheaded and quartered. The three first, as appears in their attainders, were executed for divers heresies; the three last for treason; to wit, for denying the king's supremacy, and affirming his marriage with Catharine to be good. p. 581.

Thomas Empson, sometime a monk of Westminster, who had been a prisoner in Newgate more than three years, was brought before the justices in Newgate; and for that he would not ask the king's pardon for denying his supremacy, nor be sworn thereto, his monk's cowl was plucked off his back, and his body reprieved, till the king was informed of his obstinacy. p. 591.

Dr. Forest, a friar observant, was apprehended, for that in secret he had declared to many, that the king was not

supreme head of the church. Whereupon he was condemned ; and afterwards, upon a pair of new gallows, set up for that purpose in Smithfield, he was hanged by the middle and arm-pits, alive, and under the gallows was made a fire, wherewith he was burnt and consumed. p. 577.

Hugh Farrington, abbot of Reading, and two priests named Rugg and Owen, were hanged and quartered at Reading. The same day was Richard Whiting, abbot of Glastenbury, hanged and quartered on Torehill, adjoining to his monastery. John Thorn and Roger James, monks, the one treasurer, the other under-treasurer of Glastenbury church, were at the same time executed. Also, shortly after, John Beck, abbot of Colchester, was executed at Colchester : all for denying the king's supremacy. p. 577.

Six persons, and one led between two, were drawn to Tyburn ; to wit, Laurence Cook, prior of Doncaster, William Horn, a lay-brother of the Charter-house at London, Giles Horn, gentleman, Clement Philipp, gentleman of Calais, Edmund Bolhelm, priest, Darcy Jennings, Robert Jennings, Robert Bird : and all there hanged and quartered, as having been attainted by parliament, for denying the king's supremacy. p. 581.

Sir David Jenison, knight of Rhodes, was drawn through Southwark, to Sir Thomas of Watterings, and there executed for denying the king's supremacy. *ib.*

German Gardiner, and Lark, parson of Chelsea, were executed at Tyburn, for denying the king's supremacy ; as likewise one Ashby. p. 585.

It is a fact, indisputably proved, that Henry VIII. was the *first* king of England that ever gave leave to bishops to exercise jurisdiction without being approved of at Rome, the *first* that ever styled himself head of the church, and the *first* that ever made it treason to refuse that title. This assumption surprised all Europe, and well might it do when this very same king had stood forth the champion of the pope's supremacy, as of *divine right*, against Luther, when that arch-heretic threw off the yoke of obedience. Henry charged

Luther with acting under the influence of anger, and malice, and hatred, and so it was with Henry himself. His defence was written before he became enamoured of Anne Boleyn, and when his mind was impressed with the duties and obligations of a Christian sovereign; but when his heart was filled with the flame of lust, and, like Luther, he found himself restrained and condemned by the lawful authority of the church, then it was he gave loose to his passions, and in his rage to vex and mortify the holy father who reproved him, with a view to bring him to a sense of duty, he resolved to destroy, as far as he was able, that supremacy which he had acknowledged and proved to be of divine origin, and involved his kingdom in all the horrors of schism and corruption. Perfectly sensible that reason and argument would only retard and render his designs abortive, he employed the civil sword to establish his spiritual supremacy, and made PERSECUTION the basis of his new church. We have shewn the use he made of the knife, the halter, and the fagot, to intimidate the clergy and learned into submission; it only now remains for us to shew how the people were brought over to the views of the court. To grant spiritual supremacy to a lay prince was an idea so repugnant to the people, that the proposition was everywhere received with suspicion and wonder. To remove these feelings, Harry gave orders to have the word "pope" erased out of every book used in the public worship of the church; every schoolmaster was ordered diligently to inculcate the new doctrine to his pupils; all clergymen, from the prelate to the curate, were directed to teach, every Sunday and holiday, that the king was the true head of the church, and the pope's supremacy a mere usurpation; and to prevent the truth from being known, it was made HIGH TREASON for any one to PRINT or *publish* any work against the *spiritual* supremacy of this monarch! Thus, in the process of time, the people became immersed in error, and this state of darkness has continued to the present day; though, Heaven be praised, the mist is gradually dispersing, notwithstanding the efforts of designing and ignorant revilers, and the rays of truth are beaming on this long benighted nation.

Having thus given an outline of the doctrine of supremacy, we must now return to the subject of the divorce and introduce two more prominent characters in this momentous affair.

## CRANMER AND ANNE BOLEYN.

Previous to the establishment of Henry's supremacy by act of parliament, an act was passed, condemning all appeals to Rome, though the king had been for years appealing to that see, but in vain, to be released from his virtuous wife. This act, like the suppression of the pope's supremacy, had its origin from rage, vexation, and disappointment. The next circumstance of importance was the raising of Thomas Cranmer to the primacy of the English church, which is thus stated in the *Book of Martyrs*:—"Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, having died the preceding year, was succeeded by Cranmer, who was then in Germany, disputing in the king's cause with some of the emperor's divines. The king resolved to advance him to that dignity, and sent him word of it, that so he might make haste over: but a promotion so far above his thoughts, had not its common effect on him; he had a true and primitive sense of so great a charge, and instead of aspiring to it, feared it; and returning very slowly to England, used all his endeavours to be excused from that advancement. Bulls were sent for to Rome, in order to his consecration, which the pope granted, and on the 30th of March, Cranmer was consecrated by the bishops of Lincoln, Exeter, and St. Asaph. The oath of the pope was of hard digestion to him. He there made a protestation, before he took it, that he conceived himself not bound up to it in any thing that was contrary to his duty to God, to his king, or to his country; and this he repeated when he took it."—The modern editors have made a little free here with Burnet, and left out the conclusion of the last sentence, which is this: "so that if this *seemed too artificial* for a man of his *sincerity*, yet he acted in it fairly, and above board." Such is the way that bishop Burnet attempts to bolster up the *perjury* of his hero. But let us

look a little deeper into the conduct of this man of sincerity, this leader in the work of Reformation in England. It was in 1529 that Cranmer put himself at the head of the party that favoured the divorce of Catharine. In the year following he wrote a book against the lawfulness of the queen's marriage, in which he flattered the predominant passion of the king, and became thereby a great favourite of the monarch. Burnet represents him, at this time, as devoted to Luther's doctrine, and was considered as the most learned of those who favoured it. Miss Anne Boleyn, the same author states, had also received some impressions of the same doctrine. Henry, however, was ignorant of these dispositions and designs of the enemies of the Catholic faith, and the better to deceive him, this arch-hypocrite continued to say mass and conform to the Catholic worship, while, according to Burnet, he was a Lutheran in his heart. While the suit of the king was pending at Rome, Cranmer was sent into Italy to manage the cause of Henry. In the discharge of this duty he went to Rome, where he carried on the work of dissimulation so well, that the pope made him his penitentiary, which office he accepted, though he was a Lutheran in his heart. From Rome he goes to Germany, to conduct the king's case with his Protestant friends, and here, though he had voluntarily sworn to observe perpetual chastity at his ordination as a priest, he privately married Oslander's niece, a brother reformer, and one of the most profane and dissolute wretches of the age. Some authors say he debauched her, and was then compelled to marry her. This circumstance is not sufficiently authenticated to be given as fact, but the marriage itself is certain. Cranmer, as we have before stated, was expelled Jesus' college, Cambridge, for engaging in wedlock, contrary to the statutes of the university, but his wife dying he was admitted into holy orders, on which he solemnly engaged to lead a life of celibacy: but with this man of sincerity solemn oaths were no more binding than the wind; nor did he hesitate at any profligate act of villany which was necessary to further his ends, and



serve the lustful passions of his master. It was after Cranmer had engaged a second time in wedlock, that the archbishopric of Canterbury was offered to him, which he accepted with apparent reluctance, in order to appear with better grace. But, though Cranmer and his reforming colleagues made a jest of the sacred canons and their oaths, to gratify their brutal lusts, yet the new-elect bishop was well aware that Harry had an utter aversion to *married* priests, and therefore it was necessary to dissemble still. What then was he to do? In this perplexity a lucky device came into his head, which, however, was very near ending tragically. Mr. Mason, in his work of the Consecrations of English bishops, says, "Cranmer kept his wife secret for fear of the law, and that they reported she was carried up and down in a chest, and that at Gravesend the wrong end of the chest was set upwards," by which mistake the good woman was in great danger of having her neck broken.

Such was the man whom Henry nominated to the see of Canterbury. The pope, who knew no error in him but that of maintaining the invalidity of Henry's marriage, which, as the holy see had not then decided, he was at full liberty to do, granted him the necessary bulls, which Cranmer scrupled not to receive and acknowledge, though, according to his prelatie panegyrist, he disowned in his heart this very authority. We have seen him associating with the reformers in Germany, and approving of their new doctrines; we now see him, at the nomination of a Catholic king, for Henry had not yet renounced the pope's supremacy, and by the permission of the pope, submitting to the doctrine and discipline of the church of Rome, and consenting to take the highest dignity of that church in England, for the express purpose of preserving its privileges, and seeing that its canons were duly enforced. Previous to his consecration as archbishop of Canterbury, he had to take an oath of fidelity to the holy see; this, Burnet says, "was of hard digestion to him;" but Tom was never at a loss for expedients, until he had run his career, by meeting with that same terrible end

which he had, with cold-blooded malice, prepared for so many others. He who pretended unwillingness to accept the high station offered him; he who had such "a *true* and *primitive* sense of so great a charge;" he who, "instead of aspiring to it, feared it;"—he could deliberately call his God to witness an act which he intended the world should think him *sincere* in performing, while inwardly and secretly, it is said, he protested against it. Was ever such a consummate act of perjury committed before? Can we wonder that *perjury* is now become a *trade* in this Protestant country—this land of bibles and immorality,—when we have such an example of premeditated false-swearing here set before them in the person of their first Protestant primate, who is extolled, too, as having a primitive sense of the high religious charge he was then entering upon. One of the gross calumnies raised against the Catholics by the adherents to the blessed work of Reformation was, that they paid no regard to the sanctity of an oath, and that the pope could dispense with the obligations of an oath at his pleasure. Such an infamous charge, though often repeated, and believed by too many at this day, was never *proved* against the Catholics; but here we have Cranmer treating a solemn compact with his God as a mere idle ceremony, by no means binding, and absolving himself from its obligations even before he was invested with his high functions.

We have Cranmer now seated in the primate's chair of the English church, after having taken the oath of fidelity to the see of St Peter, as supreme over the universal church of Christ. He had also, as solemnly, engaged to preserve the church of England in all her rights and privileges, such as he found them when he was installed archbishop of Canterbury, and as they had been secured by one of his predecessors, cardinal Langton, under Magna Charta. Cranmer, however, was no sooner seated in his high office, than he began to play the sycophant, the hypocrite, and the tyrant. The pope, who had granted the necessary bulls to authorize Cranmer to act canonically as archbishop, could not be

brought to consent to the divorce of Catharine ; and Henry, who had taken upon himself to be supreme head of the church in England, was resolved upon a divorce ; and he was further determined that there should be some *shew*, some *appearance of authority*, for this separation from his lawful wife. But then there was a great obstacle in the way, which was, to discover in whom this power, or authority, was lodged, and who was to be the executive minister to put it in force. To get over this difficulty, Cranmer abandons his promise of fidelity to the pope, and feigning himself another Nathan sent to reprove a second David, or a John Baptist censuring a Herod, he writes a serious letter, by virtue of his archiepiscopal authority, on Harry's incestuous marriage with Catharine ; "a marriage," he said, "the world had long been scandalized with," and declared that, for his part, he was determined to suffer no longer so great a scandal. He therefore concludes by requesting his majesty to empower him, the archbishop, to *examine* and *pronounce* a final sentence upon the question. Accordingly, the king has an instrument drawn up, which he signs and seals, giving the primate authority to call a court, and put an end to the dispute between him and his faithful wife. As this document is a novelty in the annals of history, we will here give the words of it, for the amusement of the reader. "Wherefore ye, whom God and we have ordained archbishop of Canterbury, and primate of this our realm of England, to whose office it has been, and is appertaining, by the sufferance of us and our progenitors, as you write yourself most justly and truly, to order, judge, and determine mere spiritual causes within this our realm. Therefore in your most humble wise, you apply unto us, in the said letters, to grant unto you our license to proceed to the examination and final determination of the said cause, in exoneration of your conscience towards God. Wherefore we, inclining to your humble petition, by these our letters, sealed with our seal, and signed with our sign manual, do license you to proceed in the said cause, and to the examination and final determination of the same." Here is

hypocrisy in perfection. When Cranmer wrote his letter, he knew that Catharine had been expelled the nuptial bed, and that a *private* marriage had already taken place between Anne Boleyn and Henry. Then again, the king, who is the sinner, empowers Cranmer, the reprover, to sift and pronounce upon the case. The man by whom, next to God, Cranmer was raised to his office, according to Harry's laws, is to be judged by the creature he made; a very pretty judgment, a very impartial decision, by no means to be suspected, must of course be the result. That the queen thought so, we may infer by the respect she paid to the farce about to be acted.

Cranmer was consecrated on the 30th of March, 1533, and on the 20th of May following, he opened a court at Dunstable, by the strength of the above instrument, consisting of bishops, divines and civilians. Here he summoned his royal ordainer, who answered by his proctor. He then summoned Catharine, who nobly scorned his summons and disowned his authority. For this dignified conduct she was pronounced contumacious, and on the 23rd of that same month, the archbishop pronounced sentence, that the marriage between Henry and Catharine was void from the beginning. That such a sentence would follow must have been anticipated by every man of common sense, but what can he think of the archbishop, who, though he denied in his heart the authority of the pope and the holy see, yet, in the sentence he pronounced, takes upon himself the title of legate of the holy see-apostolic! Five days after he had separated Harry from his lawful wife, by a marriage that had received the sanction of the pope and all the learned men of that age; that had been defended as valid by the brightest and most learned men then living; Cranmer confirmed the private marriage of Anne Boleyn, though that marriage had been contracted before that of Catharine was declared null, a circumstance as irregular as unprecedented. Thus then we see an affair which had occupied the court of Rome above seven years, decided by Cranmer in as many weeks, from the

time he entered on his office. Tom soon found out the secret after he was elevated to the supremacy. Let me alone, says he to Harry, I will find out the mode by which you shall get released from your old but excellent wife, and take an amorous young damsel to your bed; and this too without *scruple* to your *tender conscience*, which, I know, has been goading you, most religious monarch, these seven long years. But first make me archbishop of Canterbury, and you shall have every thing to your wishes. So it turned out; for Cranmer consented to every whim and cruelty the capricious and sanguinary-minded Harry thought proper to indulge in.

Well, the decision of Cranmer was communicated to the king in a letter from the former, who with the most exquisite hypocrisy gravely exhorted Harry to submit to the law of God, and to avoid those reproaches which he must have incurred by persisting in an incestuous intercourse with his brother's widow. But now another difficulty started. It was asked, how could the king proceed to a new marriage before the former one was annulled? Would the right of succession be less doubtful, in the case of issue by Anne than by Catharine? To silence these questions, Cranmer soon adopted an expedient. He cited another court at Lambeth, on the 28th of May, (excellent speed!) before which the proctor of the king appeared, and declared officially that Henry and Anne had been joined in wedlock, whereupon the pliant archbishop *confirmed* the same by his *pastoral* and *judicial* authority, and woe to those who had the temerity to call his decision in question. Catharine received an order to assume no other title than that of princess dowager, to which order she refused to accede, nor would she employ any one about her who did not address and acknowledge her as queen. Her fate became the subject of commiseration with foreign nations, and in England the popular feeling was in her favour. Most men, to be sure, had the prudence to be silent, but the women loudly expressed their indignation at the treatment of their queen. To check their boldness and inspire some awe, Henry committed the wife of the Viscount Rochford to the



Tower. When Clement VII. learned what Cranmer had been doing, and that Anne Boleyn was actually married to the king, he hesitated no longer on the matter. He formally annulled the sentence given by Cranmer, as uncanonical and unauthorised ; and excommunicated Henry and Anne, unless they should separate by a certain time, or shew cause why they claimed to be husband and wife.

We must now bring Anne before our readers, and let our new archbishop retire for a time to the back ground. Burnet, and the *Book of Martyrs*, say, "The convocation having thus judged in the matter, the ceremony of pronouncing the divorce judicially was now only wanting. The *new queen* being pregnant, was a great evidence of her having preserved her chastity previously to her marriage. On Easter eve, she was declared queen." And, in another place, the account says, "All people admired her conduct, who during so many years managed the spirit of so violent a king, in such a manner as neither to surfeit him with too many favours, nor to provoke him with too much rigour. They that loved the Reformation, looked for better days *under her protection* ; but many priests and friars, both in sermons and discourses, condemned the king's proceedings." Liars, they say, have but short memories, and so it turns out with this bishop Burnet, and the modern editors of the *Book of Martyrs* ; for here they confess that many priests and friars openly condemned the proceedings of Henry, whereas they told us, but a few pages preceding, that "*all* the bishops, abbots, and friars of England, Fisher only excepted," were unanimously satisfied with Henry's proceedings. Again, how are we to reconcile this statement, that Nancy's conduct was admired, "*during so many years*," by the people, when the people are represented as taking part with her unfortunate but magnanimous rival, and she lived but *three years* with the king after her public marriage with him. If those "*that loved the Reformation, looked for better days under her protection*," they found themselves most egregiously mistaken, for Harry did not begin to be that sanguinary monarch he

shewed himself, until he became acquainted with Miss Boleyn and Tom Cranmer, when he gave way to that insatiable lust and merciless cruelty which stain his character and cast a stigma on the human name. Even Burnet acknowledges that "it does not appear that cruelty was natural to him. For, in twenty-five years' reign, none had suffered for any crime against the state," except two individuals, while in the last ten years of his reign the scaffolds were reeking with blood, and the fagots constantly blazing. So that it is clear the merit here imputed to Anne Boleyn should be given to Catharine, with whom he lived happily and contented until he cast his eye on the wanton thus eulogized. But the most curious logic of these editors, is the attempt they make to bolster up the chastity of this *Angel of the Reformation*, whose pregnancy *previous* to the divorce of Catharine is made a proof of her immaculate continency. What a system of deception have the people of England been subjected to since the days of that thing called the Reformation. It is a notorious fact to those who are acquainted with history, that Anne Boleyn was the kept mistress of Henry for some time, and that she would not have been married so hastily as she was, had she not proved in a family way *before* her marriage, which marriage took place previous to the former connubial contract the king had engaged in being declared void. Yet we are here told, by men pretending to give a true knowledge of the principles of Christianity, that the very state of pregnancy of a woman *not* married, but afterwards married when the king had another wife, was "a great evidence of her having preserved her chastity previously to her marriage." This may be Protestant chastity—this may suit a Protestant bishop—but no Catholic, whether bishop or layman, will be found to whitewash such an open and barefaced state of incontinency and adultery.

Neither was her conduct, after she became queen, such as drew upon her the admiration of the people. For two years after her coronation historians take very little notice of her, only that she favoured the progress of Lutheranism, which

pleased archbishop Cranmer, and was far from being agreeable to the king. One trait of her feeling we will here give in the words of Mr. Echard, a Protestant divine, from his *History of England*. Catharine died on the 5th of January, 1536, and "the king," Mr. Echard says, "received the news of her death, not without tears, and ordered her to be buried in the abbey-church of Peterborough. But queen Anne did not carry herself so decently as became a happy rival, expressing too much joy, both in her behaviour and habit. It was but a few months after that this flourishing queen met with a fall more unfortunate and fatal than the other." This was in a violent death, which we shall relate by and by; but we must here apostrophize, to render a tribute due to virtue and misfortune, and relate the death of the noble-minded princess in the language of Dr. Lingard.

"During the three last years Catharine, with a small establishment, had resided on one of the royal manors. In most points she submitted without a murmur to the royal pleasure; but no promise, no intimidation could induce her to forego the title of queen, or to acknowledge the invalidity of her marriage, or to accept the offer made to her by her nephew, of a safe and honourable asylum either in Spain or Flanders. It was not that she sought to gratify her pride, or to secure her personal interests: but she still cherished a persuasion, that her daughter Mary might at some future period be called to the throne, and on that account refused to stoop to any concession which might endanger or weaken the right of the princess. In her retirement she was harrassed with angry messages from the king: sometimes her servants were discharged for obeying her orders; sometimes were sworn to follow the instructions they should receive from the court: Forest, her confessor, was imprisoned and condemned for high treason: the act of succession was passed to defeat her claim; and she believed that Fisher and More had lost their lives merely on account of their attachment to her cause. Her bodily constitution was gradually enfeebled by mental suffering: and feeling her health decline, she repeated a

request which had often been refused, that she might see her daughter, once at least before her death. For Mary, from the time of the divorce, had been separated from the company, that she might not imbibe the principles, of her mother. But at the age of twenty she could not be ignorant of the injuries which both had suffered; and her resentment was daily strengthened by the jealousy of a hostile queen, and the caprice of a despotic father. Henry had the cruelty to refuse this last consolation to the unfortunate Catharine, who from her death-bed dictated a short letter to ‘her most dear lord, king, and husband.’ She conjured him to think of his salvation; forgave him all the wrongs which he had done her; recommended their daughter Mary to his parental protection; and requested that her three maids might be provided with suitable marriages, and that her other servants might receive a year’s wages. Two copies were made by her direction, of which one was delivered to Henry, the other to Eustachio Chapuys, the imperial ambassador, with a request that, if her husband should refuse, the emperor would reward her servants. As he perused the letter, the stern heart of Henry was softened: he shed a tear, and desired the ambassador to bear to her a kind and consoling message. But she died before his arrival, and was buried by the king’s direction with becoming pomp in the abbey church of Peterborough. The reputation which she had acquired on the throne, did not suffer from her disgrace. Her affability and meekness, her piety and charity, had been the theme of universal praise: the fortitude with which she bore her wrongs, raised her still higher in the estimation of the public.”

Such is the account given by this eloquent writer of the last moments of this model of womankind, and even Burnet and the modern editors are compelled to acknowledge, that “she was exemplary, patient, and charitable;” and that “her virtues and her sufferings created an esteem for her in all ranks of people.” This acknowledgment we consider a complete contradiction to their former statement, that all people admired the conduct of her rival, Anne Boleyn, whose

personal manners and deportment were the very opposite of Catharine's. Anne had given birth to a princess eight months after her marriage, who was named Elizabeth, and afterwards became queen. In the same month that Catharine died, she felt the pains of premature labour, and was delivered of a dead male child. This accident proved to Henry a bitter disappointment, as it was a second failure to his hopes of male issue: and in the moment of vexation he upbraided Anne, who retorted upon him that he had no one to blame but himself, and that her miscarriage had been owing to his fondness for her maid. This was Jane Seymour, who afterwards became queen, and the incident is thus related: "When the news of Catharine's death reached the court, Henry, out of respect to her memory and virtues, ordered his servants to wear mourning on the day of her burial, while Anne decked herself out in the gayest of her apparel, and appeared in the highest spirits, saying that now she was indeed a queen, since she had no rival. But in this she found herself unluckily deceived, for in the midst of her joy, she accidentally discovered her servant Jane, before mentioned, sitting on the king's knee. Jane was the daughter of a knight of Wiltshire, remarkable for her beauty, and the sight of this familiarity awakened the flame of jealousy in Anne's mind, and produced premature labour. Thus the very circumstance which she imagined was a completion of her triumph, by the dispensation of a just Providence, turned out to be her fall. By her levity and indiscretion, so contrary to the manners of the late queen, she had given occasion to the retailers of scandal to set up some ugly reports of her conduct, which coming to the ears of Henry, an unfavourable impression was made on him, which led to Anne's immediate disgrace and imprisonment. Before, however, we proceed in this important and interesting affair, we will here give the account of it as we find it in the *Book of Martyrs*.

"The Popish party saw, with disappointment and concern, that the queen was the great obstacle to their designs. *She grew not only in the king's esteem, but in the love of the*



*nation.* During the last nine months of her life, she bestowed above £14,000 in *alms to the poor, and seemed to delight in doing good.* Soon after Catharine's death, Anne bore a dead son, which was *believed* to have made an unfavourable impression on the king's mind. It was also considered, that now queen Catharine was dead, the *king might marry another, and regain the friendship of the pope and the emperor, and that the issue by any other marriage would never be questioned.* With these *reasons of state* the king's affections joined; for he was *now in love* (if so heartless a monster was capable of feeling love) with Jane Seymour, whose disposition was tempered between the gravity of Catharine and the gaiety of Anne. The latter used all possible arts to re-inflame his dying affection; but *he was weary of her, and therefore determined on her destruction;* to effect which he soon *found a pretence.* Lady Rochford, wife to the brother of Anne, basely accused her husband of a criminal intercourse with his sister; and Norris, Weston, and Brereton, the king's servants, with Smeton, a musician, were accused of the same crime.

“ She was confined to her chamber, and the five persons before mentioned were sent to the Tower, whither, the next day, she also was carried. On the river some privy counsellors came to examine her, but she made deep protestations of her innocence of the crimes laid to her charge. Those who were imprisoned on her account denied everything, except Smeton, who, from hopes of favour and acquittal, confessed that he had been criminally connected with her; but denied it when he was afterwards brought to execution.

“ The queen was of a lively temper, and having resided long in the French court, had imbibed somewhat of the levities of that people. She was also free from pride, and hence, in her exterior, she might have condescended too much to her familiar servants.

“ Every court *sycophant* was now her enemy; and Cranmer formed the *only and honourable exception.* An order was therefore procured, *forbidding him to come to*

*court*; yet he wrote the king a long letter upon this critical juncture, wherein he acknowledged, that '*if the things reported of the queen were true, it was the greatest affliction that ever befel the king, and therefore exhorted him to bear it with patience and submission to the will of God*; he confessed he never had a better opinion of any woman than of her; and that, *next the king, he was more bound to her than to all persons living, and therefore he begged the king's leave to pray that she might be found innocent*; he loved her not a little, because of the love which she seemed to bear to God and his gospel; but if she was guilty, all that loved the gospel must HATE her, as having been the greatest slander possible to the gospel; but he prayed the king not to entertain *any prejudice to the gospel on her account, nor give the world to say, that his love to that was founded on the influence she had with him.*' But the king was inexorable. The prisoners were put on their trial; when Smeton pleaded guilty, as before; the rest pleaded not guilty; but all were condemned."

When we take into consideration the treatment of the Popish party, as the Catholics are called by Burnet, we need not be surprised that they felt concern, or that they looked upon Anne Boleyn as "the great obstacle of their *designs.*" Between the proclaiming of Anne as queen and her fall, the nation had witnessed the violent death of two of the greatest men of that age, and the execution of several religious men, for denying the supremacy of the king, which he had assumed, the suppression of several religious houses, which were the friends and supporters of the poor, and all their lands and goods conferred upon the king by an act of parliament, as were the first-fruits and tenths. In these acts of robbery and cruelty Cranmer took an active part. The venerable bishop Fisher, who had been a counsellor to the king's father, Henry VII., executor to the king's mother, and confidential adviser to the king himself, was summoned before this base upstart and consummate hypocrite, who, along with Cromwell, a butcher's son of Ipswich, but now in high favour

with Henry, because he could pander to his wishes, and a lord Audley, was appointed commissioner to take Fisher's answer concerning the oath of supremacy. The venerable bishop appeared according to summons, and had not Cranmer's conscience been scared with iron, he must have felt compunction and shame, on beholding a man grey in years, and clothed with the brightest and most heroic virtues, standing before him to speak to a question which he, his judge, had acknowledged under the solemnity of an oath. But Cranmer's heart was steeled against pity and virtue, and the appearance of the venerable confessor of the Catholic faith moved him not. When brought before the commissioners, he informed them that he had examined the oath in all its bearings, and that he could not take it with a safe conscience, unless they would give him leave to alter it in some particulars. To this request it was answered, that "the king would not in any-wise permit that the oath should admit any exceptions or alterations whatsoever;" and, added Cranmer, "you must answer directly, whether you will or will not subscribe." On this the bishop of Rochester promptly and nobly replied, "Then if you will needs have me answer directly, my answer is, that forasmuch as my own conscience cannot be satisfied, I absolutely refuse the oath." Such a decision on the part of Dr. Fisher must have struck the pliant Cranmer to the soul, and no doubt did fire him with revenge. The bishop was instantly committed to the Tower, that is, upon the 26th of April in 1534. While the good prelate remained a prisoner in the Tower, every art that cunning could devise was practised to gain him over to the oath, but he was inflexible. In the mean time a parliament was convened on the 23rd of November, which, though it lasted but fifteen days, was not idle in complying with the king's wishes. The bishop of Rochester's imprisonment, and that of all other men who should refuse to take the oath of supremacy, was voted good and lawful, which authority was wanting before, and a statute was passed whereby the supremacy of the church of England was granted unto the king

and his successors, as a title and style to his imperial crown, with all its honours, &c., and with full power to repress, reform, correct, restrain, and *amend* all heresies, &c. Which act being passed was followed by another, making it treason for any one, by word or deed, to deny the title of supremacy, as we have before noticed. After being held in confinement somewhat more than a year, he was at last compelled to take his trial like a common malefactor, the right being denied him to be tried by his peers. Several circumstances were deposed against him respecting the supremacy, but the only material evidence against him was a *private* conversation which he held with the solicitor-general, which officer was base enough to appear against him, but not without reproof from the aged and reverend prisoner, for treachery and breach of promise. On this testimony he was found guilty and condemned to suffer death, which sentence was executed on the 2nd of June, 1535, he being in the 77th year of his age. Of this great man the learned and indefatigable historian Dodd speaks thus in his Church History:—

“ It happened in these days, what is observable upon most revolutions, both persons and causes lay under a general misrepresentation, nor was the strictest virtue able to defend itself against calumny. Bishop Fisher, a person of primitive behaviour, the oracle of learning, and whom Erasmus styles the phoenix of the age; a man universally applauded in every article of his life, excepting that point for which he died; and yet even here he shewed such a contempt of all worldly advantages, that his greatest enemies, when passion did not transport them, were forced to acknowledge his sincerity. Yet notwithstanding the advantage of his character, to put a gloss upon the proceedings of the court, it was judged necessary to have him represented to the people as an obstinate, avaricious, lecherous old man, and a fit object of the king's wrath and indignation; with which sort of calumnies, Bale, Ascham, and some other virulent writers have fouled their pens, whilst others of the party have generously removed the calumny. However the people were so over-awed in their

behaviour in his regard, that no one durst speak a word, or move a step in his behalf; whereof there cannot be a greater instance, than the disrespect that was shown to his body after he was beheaded; no friend he had durst approach it; it lay exposed naked upon the scaffold, from the time he suffered till eight o'clock in the evening, when two watchmen hoisted it upon their halberts, and carried it into All-hallows Barking church-yard, where it was thrown naked into a hole, without either coffin, shroud, or any other ceremony becoming his dignity, or even that of a Christian. His head indeed was taken care of, and, as it is reported, first carried to Anne Boleyn, who being induced by an unnatural curiosity to view that countenance which had so often been displeasing to her, and flirting her hand against his mouth with a kind of scorn, one of his teeth projecting, she struck her finger against it, which razed the skin, and afterwards became a chargeable wound, the scar whereof remained as long as she lived. His head was afterwards placed upon London bridge, but within a fortnight, by order of council, was thrown into the Thames. This was done to prevent superstition; for the whole city crowded to see it, upon a report that certain rays of light were observed to shine around it. It was also thought proper to remove it upon a political account; for the clouds being now in a great measure dispersed which darkened the bishop's character, the people began to express themselves with a great deal of freedom in his favour, and the exposition of his head only served to renew the memory of so worthy a prelate, and give occasion to many to exclaim against the proceedings of the court. He was a stout champion for the dignity of the sacerdotal order; and though he would not suffer the laity to insult the clergy, upon account of their misbehaviour, yet he was always one of the first that moved for a redress, in a canonical way, and was himself, by his life and conversation, the model of a true reformation." As a proof of the very extraordinary learning and industry of this holy man, Dodd sets down twenty-one works which he composed in Latin, which were published in one folio volume,



anno 1595, besides a History of the Divorce in MS., once in the possession of Dr. Philips, dean of Rochester, who fearing it should be found upon him, and he by that means get into trouble, committed it to the flames soon after bishop Fisher's death. It is also said, that nearly a horse-load of manuscript works were burned after he was condemned.

Of Sir Thomas More, who suffered in the following month, and who was upon the most intimate terms with bishop Fisher, we must be allowed to say something, as we passed his death over slightly under a preceding head. This great lawyer was trepanned in the same manner as the bishop, by Rich, the solicitor-general, and Sir Thomas complained in court, that he had been drawn in by flattery and false friendship, and that his words had been strained and misreported. In our account of the supremacy, we stated that Sir Thomas More suffered death on no other account than that he would not consent to allow the king to be supreme head of the church, but we did not then state his reasons for this denial, which he grounded on a *political*, as well as a *religious* principle. He told them that the oath imposed by the statute was new, and never heard of before, either in England or any other Christian country; that it was expressly against the law of the gospel, which had long conferred the spiritual supremacy upon St. Peter and his successor; that it was directly against several statute laws of England, still in force, and particularly against Magna Charta, whereby all the rights of the church, as usually practised, were constantly and expressly confirmed, among which, obedience to the see of Rome, in all matters purely spiritual, was always understood; and that the statute was contrary to the king's coronation oath, which obliged him to maintain and defend the aforesaid privileges. This last objection reminds us of Cranmer's religious consideration of an oath; but, to reverse an old saying, like man like master, Henry having got a primate to his own mind, and ready to do all his dirty work, Tom could dispense with Harry's oath as easily as he could with his own, and Harry had no conscientious scruples about it, since the dispensation

had all the *form* of law. Well, Sir Thomas, as every one might have foreseen, and probably did foresee, was condemned to suffer the penalty of high treason, as his reverend and venerable friend had been, a few weeks before him; and, like Fisher, he met his fate like a man convinced of the uprightness of his conduct, and the purity of his conscience. He had done his best to vindicate his own character, that himself and children might stand unblemished before posterity, and, full of modesty and resignation, he submitted his neck to the block on the 6th day of July, in the last-named year, in the 52nd year of his age. His head was set up on London-bridge, where it remained fourteen days, when his daughter Margaret found means to convey it away. Of this great man, Dodd, before quoted, gives the following character:—

“ I might dispense with myself for entering into a detail in giving the character of this worthy person, and content myself with saying, that he was the darling of the age, and a good abridgment of all those excellencies which can be thought to make a layman valuable. Any one of the good qualities he was master of was sufficient to have recommended him to posterity; he was an universal scholar, and though he lived at a time, and in a kingdom, remarkable for learned men, yet he was without a rival, both in his way of thinking, and the manner he had in communicating himself to others. The gospel, the law, poetry, history, &c., were made familiar to him; I might have added, his skill in politics, but this was the rock he split upon. It is true no one understood the game better; but, when once he began to suspect foul play, he threw up his cards, and withdrew. ‘ Had his temper been mercenary and ambitious he might have made his fortune to what degree he had pleased; but he was altogether above the consideration of money, his conscience was not flexible enough for this purpose.’—(*Collier’s Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii.) He had a strong genius, a soul impregnated with the best ideas of things, and so beautiful a way of expressing himself, that it was altogether

peculiar to himself; he was capable of giving a relish to the most intricate points of law, the most abstracted notions of philosophy, and the soundest rules of morality. All the princes in Europe both valued and coveted him, excepting that one that enjoyed him; all the learned men in Europe were ambitious of corresponding with him. Both his writings and conversation were so well adapted for the general use of mankind, that he seemed formed on purpose to please and instruct. He was witty upon the most serious matters, and all his satires were lessons of morality, and full of compassion. 'Some think he indulged his levity too far, and that his jests were somewhat unseasonable. But, on the other side, it may be said, the divertingness of some expressions might result from the fortitude and serenity of his mind; that his frequent contemplation of death had preserved him from the least surprise, and that the nearest prospect could not disconcert his humour, or make the least alteration upon him.'—(*Ibid.*) It is, indeed, reported of him, by way of abatement to his character, that he was no friend to the mendicant orders, and sometimes made himself merry with some of their ways and practices. To which it may be replied, that his greatest admirers do not pretend to make him an angel, or exempt him from the common failings others are subject to; but that, in the main, he was no enemy, either to the mendicants, or any other religious order, plainly appears from what he wrote in their defence, against Fish, in a work called the *Supplication of Souls*. As for exposing abuses, provided he kept within bounds, he cannot suffer in his general character upon that account. And it may be farther said, in regard of his zeal, both for the church, and all the members that composed it, that, perhaps, no layman ever published more books in their defence, as his writings against Dr. Barnes, Joy, Tyndale, Fryth, but most especially against Luther, are an everlasting proof." The historian concludes with giving an account of the various compositions from the pen of this sound lawyer and honest man, which comprised nineteen works in the English language, verse and prose, and twenty-one in Latin.

We will leave the reader to decide, whether the persecution and death of these most eminent and irreproachable men were likely to obtain the favour of popular feeling. The insinuations, therefore, that Anne was gaining on the love of the nation, was a gratuitous lie, which no one will believe after what we have here stated on the authority of the most authentic writers. As to the prodigal bounty of this wanton to the poor, and her delight in seeming to do good, who, besides Burnet, and the modern editors of Fox, would have ventured such a brazen falsehood? *Where* did she get this sum of money? And *how* did she expend it? Is it not notorious that her husband was employed, during the last nine months of her life, in robbing the poor of their patrimony; and will it be believed, that this lady, whose life was one continued scene of wantonness and levity, was so intent on supplying the wants of the poor, while the king was increasing those wants?

We must now return to the account of Anne, which we have quoted from the *Book of Martyrs*. It is an abridgment of Burnet's *Abridgment*, and, we perceive, mutilated for the purpose of carrying on that system of deception which the people of England have been so long subjected to. For example, in the second paragraph, the queen is represented as protesting her innocence, and Smeton is made to charge her with guilt, and afterwards to retract the accusation at his execution. Now, Burnet in his *Abridgment*, confesses that "Anne's cheerfulness was not always governed with *decency* and *discretion*;" that she "sometimes stood upon her vindication, and at other times she *confessed* some indiscretions which she afterwards denied;" that Smeton confessed lewdness with her; that he pleaded guilty on his trial, and confessed that he had known the queen carnally three times; and that "it *was said*, that he retracted all before he died; but of that (he adds) *there is no certainty*." Let the reader now compare these admissions of Burnet, with the statement in the second paragraph of our quotation, and say if the modern editors, by their shameful suppressions, have not

been guilty of brazen-faced falsehoods. The fact is, her carriage was the very opposite of a virtuous and accomplished woman, as Catharine most undoubtedly was, and therefore she had it not her power to command the affections of the king as Catharine had, even after he had deserted her to indulge in the pursuits of lewdness and debauchery. The designs and rumours about reasons of state and disappointment of party designs, regaining the friendship of the pope, and obtaining issue by another marriage, are only so many plausibilities, put forth to cover the shame and disgrace of this defiler of the king's bed.

We are next informed that though, but a short time previous, this sweet lady was growing in the love of the nation, no sooner was she attainted of crime than every "court sycophant" became her enemy, except the redoubtable Cranmer, who is said to have adhered to her to the last. The contrary, however, was the case with our hero Tom, whose conduct towards his patroness Anne was marked with duplicity, heartlessness, ingratitude, and treachery, as we shall shew by and by. It is necessary here that we should examine the contents of the letter which our modern editors, on the authority of Burnet, say he wrote to the king. The exhortation of Cranmer to the king to bear his misfortune with patience, if the charges against his beloved friend Anne were true, is in keeping with his hypocritical letter to Henry on his pretended incestuous marriage with Catharine, when these two rare characters, of English pope and deputy, conspired to remove the lawful wife, and make room for the lady that had now been unfaithful to his royal holiness. But the asking leave to *pray* for his unfortunate mistress is as curious a request as we ever heard of. What! could he not *pray* without permission from the king any more than *preach*? Then the cant about *the gospel*, and the *love* which Anne seemed to bear to it and to God;—is any one silly enough to believe that Cranmer dared to use any such language to Henry, who had so great a predilection for Catholic doctrine, that he made Cranmer conform to it, say mass, and ordain priests accord-



ing to the Roman ritual for years, though he was, according to Burnet, a Protestant in his heart? Again, what are we to think of the archbishop's doctrine, that those who *loved* the gospel must *HATE* the *queen*, not the *crime* she had committed? The charity of the Catholic church leads her to *condemn* the *offence* but *pity* the *offender*; here, however, it is laid down that the *love* of the *gospel* inspires *hatred* to the *person* of the wicked. It is certainly not inconsistent with the avowed feelings of the modern editors, who have given circulation to this false and uncharitable production with the express view of exciting *hatred* and abhorrence of the *professors* of Popery. Next comes his hope that the *king* would not be *prejudiced* against the *gospel* on account of his *fickle wife*. Truly this is something for Cranmer to say. Did he imagine then that the king founded his gospel notions on Anne's virtues? A precious foundation, indeed; but we will acquit Henry of being such a simpleton, for he was more rogue than fool, and was probably aware of the knavish qualities of the primate he had to deal with.

Dr. Lingard gives a very different version of this affair. This learned historian says, Cranmer received an order, on the day after the arrest of Anne, to repair to his palace at Lambeth, but with an express injunction, that he should not venture into the royal presence. This order put the pliant slave into a panic, and to smooth his way he wrote an ingenious epistle to the king, in terms similar to those related. Dr. Lingard's authority is *Burnet*, and he says the letter "certainly does credit to the ingenuity of the archbishop in the perilous situation in which he thought himself placed: but I am at a loss to discover in it any trace of that high courage, and chivalrous justification of the queen's honour, which have drawn forth the praises of Burnet and his copiers." Nor can any one else, whose eye is not clouded by prejudice and ignorance. The alarm of the archbishop proved to be without foundation, though Harry had his reasons for infusing a little terror into him. Cranmer, though he had written his letter, had not dispatched it ere he was summoned to meet

some of the commissioners in the star chamber, where proofs of the queen's offence were laid before him, and he was required to dissolve the marriage between Henry and Catharine.

"It must have been," writes Dr. Lingard, "a most unwelcome and painful task. He had examined that marriage judicially; had pronounced it good and valid; and had confirmed it by his authority as metropolitan and judge. But to hesitate might have cost him his head. He acceded to the proposal with all the zeal of a proselyte: and adopting as his own the objections to its validity with which he had been furnished, sent copies of them to both the king and the queen, 'for the salvation of their souls,' and the due effect of law: with a summons to each to appear in his court, and to shew cause why a sentence of divorce should not be pronounced. Never perhaps was there a more solemn mockery of the forms of justice, than in the pretended trial of this extraordinary cause. By the king Dr. Sampson was appointed to act as his proctor: by the queen Doctors Wotton and Barbour were invested with similar powers: the objections were read: the proctor on one part admitted them, those on the other could not refute them: both joined in demanding judgment: and two days after the condemnation of the queen by the peers, Cranmer, 'having previously invoked the name of Christ, and having God alone before his eyes,' pronounced definitively that the marriage formerly contracted, solemnized, and consummated between Henry and Anne Boleyn was and always had been null and void. The whole process was afterwards laid before the members of the convocation and the two houses of parliament. The former dared not dissent from the decision of the metropolitan; the latter were willing that in such a case their ignorance should be guided by the learning of the clergy. By both the divorce was approved and confirmed. To Elizabeth, the infant daughter of Anne, the consequence was that she, like her sister, the daughter of Catharine, should be reputed illegitimate." (See the Record in Wilkins. Con. iii. 801.)

The same historian, in a note, observes, "Burnet, unac-

quainted with this instrument, informs us that the divorce was pronounced in consequence of an alleged pre-contract of marriage between Anne and Percy, afterwards earl of Northumberland: that the latter had solemnly denied the existence of such contract on the sacrament; but that Anne, through hope of favour, was induced to confess it. That Percy denied it, is certain from his letter of the 13th of May; that Anne confessed it, is a mere conjecture of the historian, supported by no authority. It is most singular that the real nature of the objection on which the divorce was founded, is not mentioned in the decree itself, nor in the acts of the convocation, nor in the act of parliament, though it was certainly communicated both to the convocation and the parliament. If the reader turn to p. 135, he will find that the king had formerly cohabited with Mary, the sister of Anne Boleyn; which cohabitation, according to the canon law, opposed the same impediment to his marriage with Anne, as had before existed to his marriage with Catharine. On this account he had procured a dispensation from pope Clement: but that dispensation, according to the doctrine which prevailed after his separation from the communion of Rome, was of no force: and hence I am inclined to believe that the real ground of the divorce pronounced by Cranmer, was Henry's previous cohabitation with Mary Boleyn: that this was admitted on both sides; and that in consequence, the marriage with Anne, the sister of Mary, was judged invalid. Perhaps it may be thought a confirmation of this conjecture, that in the parliament, as if an alarm had been already created, Henry, at the petition and intercession of the lords and commons, assented that dispensations formerly granted by the pope should be esteemed valid, and all marriages made in consequence of such dispensations before November 3rd, 1534, should stand good in law, unless they were prohibited by the express words of scripture. St. 28 Hen. VIII. 16."

Let us pause here a moment, and look into the conduct of Cranmer towards this unhappy woman. We see him

introduced into Harry's favour, through the influence of the earl of Wiltshire, father to Anne Boleyn ; we see him working zealously to place her on the throne of England, and we find it stated by Burnet, that " they who loved the Reformation, looked for better days under her protection ;" while Cranmer is represented by the same historian, as the head of the reforming party in England ; yet what do we here see ? Do we not behold the vile and hoary ingrate, not only sacrificing the child of his friend and benefactor to please the whim of an inexorable tyrant, but even consenting to wound her tenderest feelings on the verge of death, by annulling that marriage which he had solemnly pronounced good and valid, and declaring the child she had brought forth, and which had been christened by him with all the pomp and splendour of religious and royal ceremony,—a bastard. This " courtly sycophant," who is described by Burnet and the modern editors as forming the " only honourable exception" of attachment to Anne's cause, who is stated by the same authorities to have assured the king by letter, that next to him " he was more bound to her than all persons living ;" this idol of the Reformation, scrupled not to desert her the moment he found himself in jeopardy, and not only to desert, but even to stab her feelings by his base treatment, in officially tarnishing her character with infamy, and her offspring with disgrace. Is there a human being impressed with the feelings of honour, that can refrain from execrating the miscreant who could act so infamous and ungrateful a part ? Yet this is the man who is put on a level, by Fox and Burnet, and their copiers, with a Chrysostom, an Ambrose, and an Austin. It was well for him that he did not live till the infant Elizabeth he thus bastardized came to the crown, as that *virgin* queen would most assuredly have given him a Roland for his Oliver, had he fallen in her way.

On the very day Cranmer pronounced his judgment, the companions of Anne, one of them her brother, were led to execution ; and two days after, Anne herself was taken to the fatal scaffold. In giving the relation of her trial and

death, Burnet is scrupulously careful in screening Cranmer from any share in the transactions. His name is not once mentioned in the account, though he took so prominent a part in annulling the marriage. He gives us, however, more cant in a message said to have been sent by Anne to the king, in which she thanked him for all his favours, and particularly "for sending her to be a saint in heaven." Her idea of sanctity must have been a little presumptuous we think, as it does not appear that she ever positively denied or acknowledged her guilt. That she prevaricated is admitted by her panegyrists, and this must be allowed but a hollow kind of holiness to entitle any one to the rank of a saint in heaven. The modern editors, we observe, have suppressed one circumstance connected with the death of this adulteress, from partiality, we presume, to the character of Anne, and *hatred* to that of the *bloody* (as she is unjustly called) queen Mary. This princess, it will be recollected, was the daughter of Catharine, and was not allowed to see her own mother after her separation from Henry. Burnet says, that when Anne had intimation of her death, she, among other things, "reflected on her carriage to lady Mary, to whom she had been too severe a step mother; so she made one of her women sit down, and she fell on her knees before her and charged her to go to lady Mary, and in *that* posture, and in *her* name, to ask her forgiveness for all she had done against her." So, so; this candidate for a saintship in heaven; this protectress of the Reformation; this woman after Cranmer's own heart,—was a *cruel step mother* as well as a *faithless wife*. How creditable must this be to the Reformation of which Anne and Cranmer are the chief props!

Thus, only four months after the death of Catharine fell her rival Anne Boleyn, as little regarded and respected by the people as Catharine was beloved and lamented. Even Henry, a remorseless barbarian, could not receive the news of his virtuous wife's death without emotions of grief and attachment; but the day on which Anne was executed he dressed himself in his gayest apparel, and the next day



appeared as a bridegroom, by taking Jane Seymour for his wife. In closing our account of Anne Boleyn, for we have much more to say of Cranmer, it is worthy of observation, and is mentioned by Dr. Lingard in a note at the end of the fourth volume of his interesting History, that, if this queen was innocent there was something very singular in the conduct of her daughter Elizabeth. "Mary," he says, "no sooner ascended the throne, than she hastened to repeal the acts derogatory to the honour of her mother. Elizabeth sate on it five-and-forty years; yet made no attempt to vindicate the memory of *her* mother. The proceedings were not reviewed; the act of attainder and divorce was not repealed. It seemed as if she had forgotten, or wished the world to forget, that there ever existed such a woman as Anne Boleyn."

We must now revert back to year 1533, the year Cranmer was made archbishop of Canterbury. We find it stated that one Frith was burned in this year for heresy, in which case Cranmer must have had a hand in his death, he being the primate of England and one of the king's council. Frith is described as being a young man *much famed for learning*, and was the *first* who wrote in England against the corporeal presence in the sacrament. This admission is not unworthy of notice. Christianity had been part and parcel of the law of the land about 900 years, and the belief in the real presence of the sacrament was part of that system of Christianity, and had, in fact, been received with the system of our pagan ancestors. Well, then, is it not somewhat singular that during this long space of years no one should become enlightened with the truth in this country, though it abounded with learned men, but this man Frith? We are told, too, that his book falling into the hands of Sir Thomas More, that learned scholar answered it. It is further said that, "Frith never saw the answer until he was put in prison; and then, though he was loaded with irons, and had no books allowed, he replied." Prodigious! This Frith must have been a very clever man. But as he was not allowed to have

*any* books, how came he by Sir Thomas More's answer to him? And was he allowed pen, ink, and paper, though denied books? This is rather inconsistent. Frith is stated to have followed the doctrine of Zuinglius, and in his reply he insisted much on the argument, "that the Israelites did eat the same food, and drank of the same rock, and that rock was Christ; and since Christ was only mystically and by faith received by them, he concluded that he was at the present time also received only by faith. He shewed that Christ's words, 'This is my body,' were accommodated to the Jewish phrase of calling the lamb the Lord's passover; and confirmed his opinion with many passages out of the fathers, in which the elements were called signs and figures of Christ's body; and they said, that upon consecration they did not cease to be bread and wine, but remained still in their own proper natures. He also shewed that the fathers were strangers to all the consequences of that opinion, as that a body could be in more places than one at the same time, or could be in a place in the manner of a spirit; yet he concluded that, if that opinion were held only as a speculation, it might be tolerated, but he condemned the adoration of the elements as gross idolatry."

This disciple must have been *learned* indeed to make these discoveries, but none but fools and enthusiasts, we think, can give credit to his logic. How the plain words of Christ could be accommodated to the Jewish phrase, we cannot divine, but probably Frith had the same being for a teacher that his master had. Zuinglius informs us that he had great difficulty in obscuring the clearness of the expression of our Saviour, 'This is my body;' but, in the midst of his difficulty, the devil, (whether *black* or *white*, he could not tell), helped him out of it by assuring him, that, in the language of scripture, "this *is* meant this *signifies*;" and, upon this authority, Zuinglius grounded his doctrine. With regard to the passages out of the fathers, we wish that these passages had been given, which we think would have been the case, if truth had been the object of Fox, or Burnet, or the

modern editors. Of the fathers of the first five ages, we have quoted passages from their works shewing that they believed the same as Catholics now, and always did, believe, and if Frith had discovered that the passages in the works of any of the fathers had been mistranslated or falsified by Catholic writers in defence of the doctrine of the real presence, why were they not pointed out? This would have been the way to defend the cause of truth; this would have confounded his antagonists, and shamed his persecutors. But such a course was not adopted, and the reason for it was, it could not be so, the fathers being clearly on the Catholic side. Henry himself wrote in defence of the doctrine of transubstantiation, against Luther, in which the royal author says, "The most holy fathers, seeing these things, took all possible care, and used their utmost endeavours, that the greatest faith imaginable should be had towards this most propitiatory sacrament; and that it should be worshipped with the greatest honour possible. And for that cause, amongst many other things, they, with great care, delivered us this also: 'That the bread and wine do not remain in the eucharist, but is *truly* changed into the body and blood of Christ.' They taught mass to be a sacrifice, in which Christ himself is truly offered for the sins of a Christian people. And, so far as it was lawful for mortals, they adorned this immortal mystery with venerable worship and mystical rites; they commanded the people to be present in adoration of it, whilst it is celebrated, for the procuring of their salvation. Finally, lest the laity, by forbearing to receive the sacrament, should, by little and little, omit it for good and all, they have established an obligation that every man shall receive at least once a year. By those things, and many of the like nature, the holy fathers of the church, in several ages, have demonstrated their care for the faith, and veneration of this adorable sacrament." The royal disputant is clearly opposed to Frith, and shews that, so far from the fathers being strangers to the consequences of the *opinion* that a body could be in more places than one at the same

time, they held it as a positive doctrine, that, as nothing was impossible to God, his body could be in as many places as he pleased, and who can dispute the fact without denying the omnipotence of God ?

It is a piece of extreme modesty on the part of Frith, to allow the toleration of the *opinion* if held only as a *speculation*, "but he condemned," we are told, "the *adoration* of the *elements* as gross idolatry." What ! then, we are to suppose that if this enlightened reformer had been in possession of power, he would have served the believers in transubstantiation the same as they served him. But these words are put into this man's mouth, or rather they are foisted on him as part of his book. Who are the men that adore the *elements* of bread and wine ? Not Catholics. Indeed we know of no men so simple. It is a gross insinuation, intended to impose on the credulous, and make them believe that Catholics, in adoring the Host in the great and august sacrifice of the mass, give worship to the elements of bread and wine ; whereas the homage is paid to God himself, which he commanded should be given, which the apostles, and every nation on the face of the earth on receiving the light of Christianity, gave to him. It was left to the reformers of the sixteenth century to impugn the doctrine of the real presence, and deprive their blind followers of the most sublime sacrifice ever offered to the Creator of mankind, as Luther and Zuinglius acknowledged in their works.

"For these *opinions*," the narration goes on, "Frith was seized, in May, 1533, and brought before Stokesley, Gardiner, and Longland." So, then, after all, Frith's discoveries were only *opinions*, grounded on the whim or caprice of the mind, and not the received doctrines delivered by Christ to the apostles. There was also an apprentice executed with him, one Hewett, on the same account. This Hewett, Stow writes, was a tailor, and we think it would have been better for him if he had minded his thimble and sleeve-board, instead of dabbling in theology, which he certainly could not have been qualified to engage in. To come at the

true circumstances of the death of these two men is a matter of great difficulty, we might say an impossibility, at this day; we shall, therefore, content ourselves with observing, that if Frith and Hewett confined their speculative opinions to themselves, and did not attempt to disturb the peace of the king, it was an act of injustice to punish them; but if they acted in defiance of the law, and attempted to beard the constituted authorities, surely those authorities were in duty bound to notice the transgression. We are persuaded that Frith and Hewett were notorious brawlers and disturbers of the peace, or they would not have been punished in the manner they were. We are neither attempting to palliate nor justify their deaths. We condemn *religious* persecution as much as any man, but it should be shewn that those who have suffered for their opinions or creed, have suffered *solely* and exclusively on that account, and not for creating sedition, tumult, or perhaps treason, as we shall shew to have been the case with some of the pretended martyrs in Mary's reign, and as we have shewn was the case with many that have already been noticed by us.

But why should the proceedings against Frith be thought to carry with them the spirit of persecution, any more than the proceedings which occur in our days, in the courts of justice, when religious fanaticism inspires some bewildered wight to create disturbance in the streets, or insult the ministers of religion? The public journals relate the trial of a man named Hale, in the month of March, 1825, for creating confusion, and disturbing the service of the church in St. Clement's Danes, in the Strand. This man, who had been an industrious shoemaker, and realized a property, became fascinated with scripture interpretation, and conceived himself somebody of importance in Bible disputation. He got himself into trouble by spending his money in circulating handbills and pamphlets among the soldiers to dissuade them from fighting, which he maintained was contrary to the scripture. Now he is in prison for challenging the rector of a parish to public disputation in the church, having been



tried and found guilty by a jury of his countrymen, and sentenced to pay a fine, which being unable or unwilling to do, he is continued in imprisonment until he complies with his sentence. There can be no doubt that this man is impelled by what he considers a sense of duty ; but it is evidently an erroneous impression, and therefore it is necessary, for the sake of peace and justice, that he should be restrained from playing his freaks. Such a proceeding can no more be fairly termed persecution, than the execution of a real malefactor ; neither can we call the case of Frith an act of religious persecution, unless it can be clearly proved that he was burned solely and exclusively for believing in the opinions set forth. But admitting that he suffered for conscience sake, and that he was martyred for the truth, where was the great and heroic Cranmer, the chief promoter of the Reformation, that he did not attempt to save the life of Frith ? He was then the primate of all England ; he was fully convinced, we are informed, of the necessity of a Reformation ; yet he coolly allowed poor Frith to be burned for opinions which he privately held himself, but openly taught the contrary. Verily, this Tom Cranmer was a villain of the blackest dye.

The modern editors tell us, “ this was the last instance of the cruelty of the clergy at that time ; ” and “ gave the new preachers and their followers some respite. ” They would have come much nearer the truth, had they said, that *now* the bloody work commenced of hanging, embowelling, and quartering, for conscience sake. The king was now, by act of parliament, supreme head of the church, and was empowered to reform all *heresies* and *idolatries* ; or rather, what he and his satellites might term heresies and idolatries, as it suited their caprice or interest. The queen, too, that is, the chaste Anne Boleyn, for we are treating of a period anterior to her death, according to Burnet, “ openly protected the reformers ; *she* took Latimer and Shaxton to be her chaplains, and promoted them to the bishoprics of Worcester and Salisbury. Cranmer is represented as “ well prepared for that work, to which the providence of God now called him ; ”

and "Cromwell was his great and constant friend." Thus, then, every thing was well arranged for the blessed work cut out by the reformers, and it is now our duty to point out what that work was. But first let us give the reader some account of the new character we have before us, and who made so conspicuous a figure in the transactions of the day, till he at last fell into the trap he had prepared for some of those who were opposed to his iniquitous deeds.

Thomas Cromwell was born at Putney, near London, his father being a blacksmith at that place. In the early part of his life he entered as a private soldier in the duke of Bourbon's army, and was at the pillage of Rome by that general, so that he was early initiated in the scenes of rapacity which afterwards followed in his own country. Returning home, he was taken into the service of cardinal Wolsey, by whom he was employed to manage the revenues of the dissolved monasteries, which the cardinal had designed for his projected new colleges. On the fall of his master, Cromwell rose out of his ashes, and became the favourite and confidant of Henry, who raised him to several places of honour and profit, and at last made him vicar-general to his royal pope-ship, a post never before heard of, and we believe never enjoyed by any other man. By degrees his honours swelled into titles. He was first created lord Cromwell, then made a knight of the garter, and afterwards earl of Essex. This last title was conferred upon him for being the chief projector of the match between Henry and Anne of Cleves, which afterwards turned to his downfall. Such was the man who was made "vicar-general, and visitor of all the monasteries and churches in England, with a delegation of the king's supremacy to him; he was also empowered to give commissions subaltern to himself; and all wills, where the estate was in value above £200, were to be proved in his court. This was afterwards (Burnet says) enlarged: he was made the king's vicegerent in ecclesiastical matters; had the precedence of all persons, except the royal family; and his authority was in all points the same as had been formerly exercised by the

pope's legates." Yet, be it observed, this Cromwell was a layman. In parliament this son of a blacksmith sat before the archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer, and he superseded him in the presidency of the convocation. This degradation caused some murmurs among the bishops, but farther mortifications were reserved for the men who had basely deserted their duty and bowed to usurped power. They were exhorted, and meanly complied, to admit that they did not derive their power from Christ, but were merely the delegates of the crown. To such a degree of humiliation were these men reduced, who but a short time before were looked upon as the instructors of the people, the protectors of their rights, and the fathers of the poor.

#### DESTRUCTION OF THE MONASTERIES.

Before we proceed to detail the horrible sacrileges, and the Vandalic outrages perpetrated by our gospel reformers, under the cloak of religion, in which savage and unjust proceedings Cranmer and Cromwell acted so conspicuous a part, we shall put the reader in possession of the origin and benefit of the monastic orders, that a clear view may be seen of the vast mischief that accrued to the literature, morality, freedom, and happiness of the country, by the destruction of these seats of learning, virtue, and hospitality. No order of men, we believe, have been subjected to so much calumny, scurrility, and invective, as the orders of monachism in the Catholic church, and no order of men are more entitled to the praises of the world for the good they have done mankind. The monastic order is almost coeval with Christianity, and existed in this island before the second conversion of its inhabitants by St. Augustine, who was himself a monk. Dr. Milner, in his *History of Winchester*, speaking of the monks of that cathedral, says, "It is certain there were many other monasteries at this period in Britain, as, for example, those of Bangor, Glassenbury, Abingdon, &c. Of the first mentioned monastery three abbots were famous, Pelagius, the heretic, A.D. 400; Gildas, the writer, in 550; and Nennius, the

historian, in 620." The monastic orders were also established in Ireland on the preaching of Christianity there, the famous monastery on the isle of Arran having been founded by St. Ailbee, who was a disciple of St. Patrick, and as the light of truth spread through the country, monasteries were founded and endowed by the piety of the new converts. These institutions were governed by rules grounded on the purest principles of charity and piety, and everywhere shed a light of cheerfulness, virtue, and content, not only among the inmates of the cloister, but among the different classes of villagers which sprung up around the monastery; for it should be observed, that there was scarcely a town or village in England that did not owe its origin to the foundation of some monastery, the recluses in which were the instructors of the ignorant, the physicians of the sick, the comforters of the helpless, the supporters of the traveller, and the fathers of the poor. To give some idea of the extent to which the rules of hospitality were carried, it is recorded that there were sometimes no less than 500 travellers on horseback entertained at a time at Glassenbury abbey. Now, as the monks were bound by their rules to provide all travellers, from the baron to the beggar, with all necessaries, some notion may be formed by this one fact of the vast public benefit that accrued from these institutions. But this is only a single advantage derived from these calumniated orders. To them we may consider ourselves indebted for those civil rights which form the fundamental pillars of the British Constitution, and which in its pure state is the most perfect system of rational liberty ever devised by the human mind

It has been fashionable, since the destruction of these religious orders, to represent the members of them as "lazy idle drones," and whether we look into a novel or romance, or glance at the stage, we shall see the monk portrayed as a monster of intemperance, gluttony, lewdness, and every species of villany that defiles the human heart. To set the reader right on these detestable practices to keep alive prejudices and foster ignorance we will here give the life of a

monk, from Dr. Milner's *Winchester*, vol. ii. p. 116. The learned historian, speaking of the Benedictine order founded in that city, writes:—"The objects of this course of life may be learned from the rule of that saint; namely, to withdraw as much as possible from dangerous temptations, also to learn and practise the gospel lessons in their original strictness and perfection. Its primary and essential obligations were, to have all things in common with their brethren, no person being allowed to possess any property as his own; to observe perpetual chastity; and to live in obedience to their religious superiors. It will be supposed that prayer occupied a great part of their time. In the following account, however, of the economy of a monastic life, it is to be observed that the spiritual exercises, called the canonical hours, were, with some variations as to the times of performing them, equally incumbent on secular canons and the clergy in general as on the monks. The time of the monks' rising was different, according to the different seasons of the year, and the festivals that were solemnized; but the more common time appears to have been about the half hour after one in the morning, so as to be ready in the choir to begin the night office, called *Nocturnæ Vigiliæ*, by two. When these consisted of three nocturns, or were otherwise longer, the monks of course rose much earlier. In later ages, the whole of this office, and that of the *Matutinæ Laudes*, were performed together, and took up, in the singing of them, about two hours. There was now an interval of an hour, during which the monks were at liberty in some convents (for this was far from being the case in all) again to repose for a short time on their couches; but great numbers every where spent this time in private prayer. At five began the service called *Prime*; at the conclusion of which the community went in procession to the chapter-house, to attend to the instructions and exhortations which we have spoken of above. The chapter being finished, they proceeded again to the church, to assist at the early, or what was called the *Capitular Mass*. This being finished, there was a space of an hour, or an hour and a half,



which was employed in manual labour or in study. At eight they again met in the choir to perform the office called Terce, or the third hour, which was followed by the High Mass ; and that again by the Sext or the office of the sixth hour. These services lasted until near ten o'clock, at which time, in later ages, when it was not a fasting day, the community proceeded to the refectory to dine. They returned after dinner processionally to the church, in order to finish their solemn grace. There was now a vacant space of an hour or an hour and a half, during part of which, those who were fatigued were at liberty to take their repose, according to the custom in hot countries, which was called from the time of the day when it was taken, the Meridian. Others employed this time in walking and conversing, except on those days when a general silence was enjoined. At one o'clock, None, or the ninth hour, was sung in the choir, as were Vespers at three. At five they met in the refectory, to partake of a slender supper, consisting chiefly, both as to victuals and drink, of what was saved out of the meal at noon ; except on fasting days, when nothing, or next to nothing, was allowed to be taken. The intermediate spaces were occupied with spiritual reading, or studying ; or with manual labour, which frequently consisted in transcribing books. After the evening refection, a spiritual conference or collation was held, until the office called Complin began, which, with certain other exercises of devotion, lasted until seven o'clock ; when all retired to their respective dormitories, which were long galleries containing as many beds as could be ranged in them, separated from each other by thin boards or curtains. On these the monks took their rest, without taking off any part of their clothes." Let the reader now say whether the charge of *laziness*, so often applied to monkhood, be or be not a false and foul imputation.

To this valuable body of men we are indebted for much of that ancient literature we now possess, and indeed, had it not been for their industry and care, the bible itself might have been lost to the world. To give some light as to the

extent and usefulness of the labours of these holy and humble men in transcribing books, before the art of printing was known, there were in the library at Peterborough one thousand seven hundred MSS. Leland and Stow tell us the library of the Grey Friars in London, built by Sir Richard Whittington, was one hundred and twenty-nine feet long and thirty-one broad, and well filled with books. Ingulf says, that when the library at Croyland was burned in 1091, seven hundred books were lost by the fire. In a word, each monastery had its library, and the greatest care and labour were used to have them well furnished with useful volumes. The libraries of the greater monasteries were likewise the depositaries of the charter of liberties, the acts of parliament, and other documents of moment. The registers of kings and public transactions were compiled and preserved in them. It was in one of these monasteries that Stephen Langton, the cardinal archbishop of Canterbury, found a copy of the charter of liberties granted by Henry the First, which he communicated to the barons, who were dissatisfied with the faithless and tyrannical proceedings of king John, and by means of this document and their own patriotic steadiness they wrung from the tyrant monarch the great bulwark of British freedom, Magna Charta.

Such is a brief outline of the religious orders which Cranmer and Cromwell sought to abolish, before they could introduce those novelties in religion which the former afterwards contrived to establish in this country. To prepare the way for this change and conspiracy against the liberties and happiness of the kingdom, the most malicious reports were set on foot, charging the monasteries with engrossing and monopolizing trade and manufactures; visitors were appointed by Cromwell, to sift and examine into the conduct of the religious of both sexes; and that this hitherto unheard-of Inquisition might not be disrelished by the people, plausible reasons were given out, to smooth the most odious part of the business. Great pains were now taken to cause it to be believed that the most criminal abuses existed in these recep-

tacles of rest for the traveller, and support for the infirm and the poor. Ignorance, sloth, lasciviousness, avarice, superstition, and fraud of all kind, were laid at the door of these institutions, and by daily lampoons and table talk many people were brought to believe what, but a short time before, would have been thought incredible. But lest these oral calumnies should fail, the press, which was now brought to some perfection, was put into requisition, and one Fish, a lawyer, published a most virulent book against all churchmen, in which he attacked the monks unsparingly, representing them as the cause of all the poverty in the nation, and to give a greater colour to his misrepresentations, he called the work *The Supplication of Beggars*. Of this work, Mr. Dodd says, "It is hard to determine whether the language or matter is more scandalous. He paints out all the bishops, deans, archdeacons, priests, monks, friars, &c., as a herd of lazy drones, that devour the king's lands; that they are the occasion of all the taxes, of beggary at home, and want of success abroad; that they excommunicate, absolve, &c., merely for gain; that they debauch the wives, daughters, and servants of the whole kingdom; that they are thieves, highwaymen, ravenous wolves, and cormorants; that he hopes the king will take it into consideration to have them reduced, tied to a cart, whipped, turned adrift, and entirely demolished, as enemies to his state and to all mankind. Had the devil been employed in the work, he could not have made an apology more suitable to the times; for though the book was levelled against religion in general, and had the visible marks of iniquity stamped upon it, yet such was the humour of king Henry's days, that when it was offered to him by Anne Boleyn, as an ingenious performance, it was read at court with singular pleasure, and many hints taken from it in order to promote the cause in hand."

To such purposes was the press applied in its infancy, and to such ends it has been since employed; to keep the people of this country ignorant of the chief cause of the miseries they have endured, and now endure, and will con-

tinue to endure, until the vengeance of God shall have been satisfied for the crimes committed by the sham reformers against his divine commandments, and he shall once more deign to shower his blessings on the land which was once the seat of true religion and civil freedom. When the invaluable art of printing was first invented, the clergy, though represented as striving to keep the people in darkness, were its chief patrons and protectors, when properly applied. Report says, the first printing office was in a chapel in Westminster Abbey, and probably the first printers were monks. From this circumstance, printing-offices are to this day called *chapels*, and *monk* and *friar* are technical terms used for such parts of a page as are not touched with ink, or are blurred with too large a quantity of it. We have not heard that, previous to the event called the Reformation, but which, it has been justly observed, should rather be called a *Devastation*, one single instance can be proved of the press being prostituted to the service of falsehood, detraction, and calumny; but no sooner did the pretended reformers break with the Catholic church, than this instrument was put into requisition, to vilify the most eminent characters living, and spread forth the blackest lies that could be invented. Even Henry VIII., before he assumed the supremacy of the church, had recourse to the press in defence of the ancient faith, as we have before shewn, and, while he adhered to the unerring principles of truth, proved how useful a discovery the art of printing was. Of this advantage he and his minions were so sensible, that when he departed from the course of truth and justice, a law was passed which restricted every individual from applying the press in defence of those two attributes of the Deity, while hirelings were employed to exercise it in the adverse cause, and traduce every person who had the courage and honesty to declare themselves in favour of the ancient laws and usages of England.

Matters were thus prepared, and the visitors performed their parts to the utmost satisfaction of their employers, by encouraging some of the members of monasteries to im-

peach one another, and privately setting lewd young men to tempt the nuns to impurity, that they might purposely turn informers. Speaking of the means used to blast the reputation of these religious orders, Dr. Heylin, in his *History of the Reformation*, observes, "Where these tricks were played, it may be feared that God was not in that terrible wind which threw down so many monasteries and religious houses in the reign of Henry VIII. The monks' offences were represented in such multiplying glasses, as made them seem both greater in number and more horrid in nature indeed than they were." Exclusive of the charge of immorality, the monks were represented, (as the Catholic priests of Ireland are now by the Evangelicals and Bible Missionaries), as impostors, seducing the people by false miracles and strange operations, performed by images, crosses, relics, &c. These calumnies and charges were laid before parliament, and an act was passed for the dissolution of the lesser houses of both sexes, as abandoned to sloth and immorality. The parliament which passed this nefarious act had continued, by successive prorogations, six years, and was the first, we believe, that had ever sat so long a time in England. The bill was introduced and hurried through the two houses, though not without some opposition; but opposition in those times, as well as in our own, has but little weight in the scale of corruption. The act having passed, no time was lost in putting the same into effect, and how it was done we think cannot be better described than in the following relation by Sir Wm. Dugdale, in his celebrated *History of Warwickshire*. Speaking of the dissolution of a particular convent of nuns, called Polesworth, he says:—

"I find it left recorded by the commissioners that were employed to take surrender of the monasteries in this shire, An. 29, Henry VIII., that, after strict scrutiny, not only by the fame of the country, but by examination of several persons, they found these nuns virtuous and religious women, and of good conversation. Nevertheless it was not the strict and regular lives of these devout ladies, nor anything that



might be said in behalf of the monasteries, that could prevent their ruin then approaching. So great an aim had the king to make himself thereby glorious, and many others no less hopes to be enriched in a considerable manner. But to the end that such a change should not overwhelm those that might be active therein, in regard the people everywhere had no small esteem of these houses, for their devout and daily exercises in prayers, alms-deeds, hospitality, and the like, whereby not only the souls of their deceased ancestors had much benefit, as was then thought, but themselves, the poor, as also strangers and pilgrims, constant advantage; there wanted not the most subtle contrivances to effect this stupendous work that, I think, any age has beheld; whereof it will not be thought impertinent, I presume, to take here a short view.

“In order, therefore, to it, was that which cardinal Wolsey had done for the founding his colleges in Oxford and Ipswich, made a precedent: viz., the dissolving of above thirty religious houses, most very small ones, by the licence of the king, and pope Clement VII. And that it might be the better carried on, Mr. Thomas Cromwell, who had been an old servant to the cardinal, and not a little active in that, was the chief person pitched upon to assist therein. For I look upon this business as not originally designed by the king, but by some principal ambitious men of that age, who projected to themselves all worldly advantages imaginable, through that deluge of wealth which was like to flow amongst them by this hideous storm.

“First, however, having insinuated to the king matter of profit and honour, (viz. profit by so vast enlargement of his revenue, and honour in being able to maintain mighty armies to recover his right in France, as also to strengthen himself against the pope, whose supremacy he himself abolished, and make the firmer alliance with such princes as had done the like), did they procure Cranmer’s advancement to the see of Canterbury, and more of the Protestant clergy to other bishopricks and high places; to the end that the rest should

not be able in a full council to carry any thing against their design; sending out preachers to persuade the people to stand fast to the king, without fear of the pope's curse, or his dissolving their allegiance.

“Next, that it might be more plausibly carried on, care was taken so to represent the lives of monks, nuns, canons, &c., to the world, as that the less regret might be made at their ruin. To which purpose Thomas Cromwell, being constituted general visitor, employed sundry persons, who acted therein their parts accordingly: viz., Richard Layton, Thomas Leigh, and William Petre, doctors of law; Dr. John London, dean of Wallingford, and others; by which they were to enquire into the behaviour of the religious of both sexes; which commissioners, the better to manage their design, gave encouragement to the monks, not only to accuse their governors, but to inform against each other; compelling them also to produce the charters and evidences of their lands, as also their plate and money, and to give an inventory thereof. And hereunto they added certain injunctions from the king, containing most severe and strict rules; by means whereof, divers, being found obnoxious to their censure, were expelled; and many, discerning themselves not able to live free from some exception or advantage that might be taken against them, desired to leave their habit.

“Having, by these visitors, thus searched into their lives, (which, by a black book, containing a world of enormities, were represented in no small measure scandalous), to the end that the people might be better satisfied with their proceedings, it was thought convenient to suggest, that the lesser houses, for want of good government, were chiefly guilty of these crimes that were laid to their charge; and so they did, as appears by the preamble to that act for their dissolution, made in the twenty-seventh of Henry VIII.; which parliament, (consisting in the most part of such members as were packed for the purpose through private interest, as is evident by divers original letters of that time, many of the nobility for the like respects also favouring the design), assented to

the suppressing of all such houses as had been certified of less value than two hundred pounds per annum, and giving them, with their lands and revenues, to the king ; yet so as not only the religious persons therein should be committed to the great and honourable monasteries of the realm, where they might be compelled to live religiously for the reformation of their lives, wherein thanks be to God, religion is well kept and observed (they are the words of the act), but that the possessions belonging to such houses should be converted to better uses, to the pleasure of Almighty God, and the honour and profit of the realm.

“ But how well the tenor thereof was pursued, we shall see ; these specious pretences being made use of for no other purpose, than, by opening this gap, to make way for the total ruin of the greater houses, wherein it is by the said act acknowledged, that religion was so well observed. For no sooner were the monks, &c., turned out, and the houses demolished, (that being first thought requisite, lest some accidental change might conduce to their restitution), but care was taken to prefer such persons to the superiority in government upon any vacancy in those greater houses, as might be instrumental to their surrender, by tampering with the convent to that purpose ; whose activeness was such that, within the space of two years, several convents were wrought upon, and the commissioners sent down to take them at their hands to the king’s use ; of which number I find, that besides the before specified doctors of law, there were thirty-four commissioners.

“ The truth is, that there was no omission of any endeavours that can well be imagined, to accomplish these surrenders ; for so subtly did the commissioners act their parts, as that, after earnest solicitation with the abbots, and finding them backward, they first tempted them with good pensions during life ; whereby they found some forward enough to promote the work, as the abbot of Hales in Gloucestershire was, who had high commendation for it from the commissioners, as their letters to the visitor-general manifest. So likewise had the abbot of Ramsay and the prior of Ely. Nay,

some were so obsequious that, after they had wrought the surrender of their own houses, they were employed as commissioners to persuade others; as the prior of Gisborn in Yorkshire, for one. Neither were the courtiers inactive in driving on this work; as may be seen by the lord chancellor Audley's employing a special agent to treat with the abbot of Athelney, and to offer him 100 marks per annum pension in case he would surrender; which the abbot refused, insisting upon a greater sum; and the personal endeavours he used with the abbot of S. Osithe in Essex, as by his letter to the visitor-general, wherein it is signified, that he had with great solicitation prevailed with the said abbot; but withal insinuating his desire, that his place of lord chancellor being very chargeable, the king might be moved for an addition of some more profitable offices unto him. Nay, I find that this great man, the lord chancellor, hunting eagerly after the abbey of Walden in Essex, (out of the ruins whereof afterwards that magnificent fabrick called by the name of Audley-Inn, was built), as an argument to obtain it, did, besides the extenuation of its worth, allege, that he had in this world sustained great damage and infamy in serving the king, which the grant of that would recompense.

“Amongst the particular arguments which were made use of by those that were averse to surrender, I find that the abbot of Feversham alleged the antiquity of their monastery's foundation, viz., by king Stephen, whose body, with the bodies of the queen and prince, lay there interred, and for whom were used continual suffrages and commendations by prayers. Yet it would not avail; for they were resolved to effect what they had begun, by one means or other; in so much, that they procured the bishop of London to come to the nuns of Sion, with their confessor, to solicit them thereunto; who, after many persuasions, took it upon their consciences, that they ought to submit unto the king's pleasure therein, by God's law. But what could not be effected by such arguments and fair promises, (which were not wanting or unfulfilled, as appears by the large pensions that some active

monks and canons had in comparison of others, even to a fifth or sixth-fold proportion more than ordinary), was by terror and severe dealing brought to pass. For under pretence of dilapidation in the buildings, or negligent administration of their offices, as also for breaking the king's injunctions, they deprived some abbots, and then put others that were more pliant in their rooms.

“ From others they took their convent seals, to the end they might not, by making leases or sale of their jewels, raise money, either for supply of their present wants, or payment of their debts, and so be necessitated to surrender. Nay, to some, as in particular to the canons of Leicester, the commissioners threatened, that they would charge them with adultery and sodomy, unless they would submit. And Dr. London told the nuns of Godstow, that because he found them obstinate, he would dissolve the house by virtue of the king's commission, in spite of their teeth. And yet all was so managed that the king was solicited to accept of them; not being willing to have it thought they were by terror moved thereunto; and special notice was taken of such as gave out that their surrender was by compulsion.

“ Which courses, (after so many that, through underhand corruption, led the way), brought on others apace; as appears by their dates, which I have observed from the very instruments themselves; in so much that the rest stood amazed, not knowing which way to turn themselves. Some therefore thought fit to try whether money might save their houses from this dismal fate so near at hand; the abbot of Peterborough offering 25,000 marks to the king, and 300 pounds to the visitor-general. Others with great constancy refused to be thus accessory in violating the donations of their pious founders. But these, as they were not many, so did they taste of no little severity. For touching the abbot of Fountains, in Yorkshire, I find, that being charged by the commissioners for taking into his private hands some jewels belonging to that monastery, which they called theft and sacrilege, they pronounced him perjured, and so deposing



him, extorted a private resignation. And it appears that the monks of the charter-house, in the suburbs of London, were committed to Newgate; where with hard and barbarous usage, five of them died, and five more lay at the point of death, as the commissioners signified; but withal alleged that the suppression of that house, being of so strict a rule, would occasion great scandal to their doings: for as much as it stood in the face of the world, infinite concourse coming from all parts to that populous city, and therefore desired it might be altered to some other use. And lastly, I find, that under the like pretence of robbing the church, wherewith the aforesaid abbot of Fountaines was charged, the abbot of Glastonbury, with two of his monks, being condemned to death, was drawn from Wells upon a hurdle, then hanged upon a hill called the Tor, near Glastonbury, his head set upon the abbey gate, and his quarters disposed of to Wells, Bath, Ilchester, and Bridgewater. Nor did the abbots of Colchester and Reading fare much better, as they that will consult the story of that time may see. And for farther terror to the rest, some priors and other ecclesiastical persons, who spoke against the king's supremacy, a thing then somewhat uncouth, were condemned as traitors, and executed.

“And now, when all this was effected, to the end that it might not be thought these things were done with a high hand, the king having protested that he would suppress none without the consent of his parliament, (it being called April 28, 1539, to confirm these surrenders so made), there wanted not plausible insinuations to both houses for drawing on their consent with all smoothness thereto: the nobility being promised large shares in the spoil, either by free gift from the king, easy purchases, or most advantageous exchanges, and many of the active gentry advancements to honours with increase of their estates; all which we see happened to them accordingly. And the better to satisfy the vulgar, it was represented to them, that by this deluge of wealth the kingdom should be strengthened with an army of 40,000 men, and that for the future they should never be charged with

subsidies, fifteenths, loans, or common aids. By which means, the parliament ratifying the abovesaid surrenders, the work became completed: for the more firm settling whereof, a sudden course was taken to pull down and destroy the buildings; as had been done before upon the dissolution of smaller houses, whereof I have touched. Next, to distribute a great proportion of their lands amongst the nobility and gentry, as had been projected, which was accordingly done: the visitor general having told the king that the more that had interest in them, the more they would be irrevocable.

“And lest any domestic stirs, by reason of this great and strange alteration, should arise, rumours were spread abroad, that cardinal Pole laboured with divers princes to procure forces against this realm, and that an invasion was threatened; which seemed the more credible, because the truce concluded between the emperor and the French king was generally known, neither of them wanting a pretence to invade England. And this was also seconded by a sudden journey of the king unto the sea coasts; unto divers parts whereof he had sent sundry of the nobles and expert persons to visit the ports and places of danger, who failed not for their discharge upon all events to affirm the peril in each place to be so great, as one would have thought every place needed a fortification. Besides, he forthwith caused his navy to be in readiness, and muster to be taken over all the kingdom. All which preparations being made against a danger believed imminent, seemed so to excuse the suppression of the abbeyes, as that the people, willing to save their own purses, began to suffer it easily; especially when they saw order taken for building such forts.

“But let us look a little upon the success: wherein I find that the visitor general, the grand actor of this tragical business, having contracted upon himself such an odium from the nobility, by reason of his low birth, (though not long before made knight of the garter, earl of Essex, and lord high chancellor of England), as also from the Catholics, for having thus operated in the dissolution of abbeyes, that (before the

end of the aforesaid parliament wherein that was ratified which he had with so much industry brought to pass) the king, not having any use of him, gave way to his enemies' accusations; whereupon, being arrested by the duke of Norfolk at the council table, when he least dreamt of it, and committed to the Tower, he was condemned by the same parliament for heresy and treason, unheard, and little pitied; and on the 28th of July, viz. four days after the parliament was dissolved, had his head cut off on Tower Hill.

“And as for the fruit which the people reaped, after all their hopes built upon those specious pretences which I have mentioned, it was very little. For it is plain, that subsidies from the clergy and fifteenths of laymen's goods were soon after exacted: and that in Edward the VI.'s time, the commons were constrained to supply the king's wants by a new invention, viz., sheep, clothes, goods, debts, &c., for three years; which tax grew so heavy, that the year following they prayed the king for a mitigation thereof. Nor is it a little observable, that whilst the monasteries stood, there was no act for the relief of the poor, so amply did those houses give succour to them that were in want; whereas in the next age, viz., 39 Elizabeth, no less than eleven bills were brought into the house of commons for that purpose.”

We might rest satisfied with this testimony in favour of the religious orders, and exposure of the black villanies of the devastators, but to render the cause of truth more firm, and prevent idle cavil, we will here add a confirmation to the learned knight's statement, which is taken from Mr. Thomas Hearn's preliminary observations upon Mr. Brown Willis's View of the Mitred Abbeys. This gentleman makes a solemn declaration of his being a sincere member of the church of England, and must, therefore, be deemed an unexceptionable witness. He writes thus:—“Popery (as I take it), signifies no more than the errors of the church of Rome. Had he, (Henry VIII.) therefore, put a stop to those errors, he had acted wisely, and very much to the content to all truly good and religious men. But then this

would not have satisfied the ends of himself and his covetous and ambitious agents. They all aimed at the revenues and riches of the religious houses; for which reason no arts or contrivances were to be passed by, that might be of use in obtaining these ends. The most abominable crimes were to be charged upon the religious, and the charge was to be managed with the utmost industry, boldness, and dexterity. This was a powerful argument to draw an odium upon them, and so make them disrespected and ridiculed by the generality of mankind. And yet, after all, the proofs were so insufficient, that, from what I have been able to gather, I have not found any direct one against even any single monastery. The sins of one or two particular persons do not make a Sodom. Neither are violent and forced confessions to be esteemed as the true result of any one's thoughts. When, therefore, even these artifices would not do, the last expedient was put in execution, and that was ejection by force; and to make these innocent sufferers the more content, pensions were settled upon many, and such pensions were in some measure proportioned to their innocence. Thus, by degrees, the religious houses and the estates belonging to them, being surrendered unto the king, he either sold or gave them to the lay-nobility, and gentry, contrary to what he had at first pretended; and so they have continued ever since, though not without visible effects of God's vengeance and displeasure, there having been direful anathemas and curses denounced by the founders upon such as should presume to alienate the lands, or do any other voluntary injury to the religious houses. I could myself produce many instances of the strange and unaccountable decay of some gentlemen in my own time, though otherwise persons of very great piety and worth, who have been possessed of abbey-lands: but this would be invidious and offensive, and therefore I shall only refer those that are desirous of having instances laid before them, to shew the dismal consequences that have happened, to Sir Henry Spelman's *History of Sacrilege*, published in 8vo, in the year 1698."

The reader has here before him an account of the vile artifices made use of by the visitors to blacken the fair fame of the religious orders, and bring about what soon followed, the destruction of ecclesiastical property which was devoted to most sacred purposes. Let the bigots of the present day continue to circulate the venomous calumnies of Fox and Burnet, and other lying writers, who, to palliate the infamy and scandal of these barbarous and gothic proceedings, invented the false charges of looseness and irregularity against the religious orders; thank God, the press is not now shackled as it was by the evangelical disciples of liberty, at the very birth of their devastating Reformation, and the honest part of it will now perform its duty, and make known the real state of the case. Opposed to the lies of Fox and Burnet, we have even the parliament of Henry declaring that religion was well kept and observed in the greater houses, and Mr. Hearn, whom we have just quoted, states it as a positive fact, that not one direct proof was brought against any one single monastery, great or small, of the crimes laid to their charge.

The modern editors of Fox, copying from his cousin-german Burnet, say,—“The most horrible and disgusting crimes were found to be practised in many of the houses; and vice and cruelty were more frequently the inmates of these pretended *sanctuaries*, than religion and piety. The report (of the visitors) contained many abominable things, not fit to be mentioned; some of these were printed but the greatest part *was lost*.” We have no doubt the report *did* contain many “abominable things,” but then these “abominable things” were mere *report*,—sheer slander and lies— invented for a cloak to conceal the *real* acts of vice, cruelty, and injustice committed by the pretended reformers. If the monks and nuns were such dissolute and worse than beastly wretches, as represented by Burnet, why were they not punished for their abominable crimes, as an example to future members of religious orders, and in vindication of the suppressing deeds of the visitors? But not one criminal



have we on record to support the base insinuations of Burnet and Fox ; not one single offender has Burnet and the modern editors furnished to bear out their infamous charges—whilst history records the slaughter of fifty-nine persons, (among whom were a bishop, an ex-lord-chancellor, six doctors of divinity, three abbots, several Carthusian, Benedictine, and Franciscan friars, and many secular clergymen), for opposing and denying the king's spiritual supremacy. Twenty were executed for rising in defence of monastic lands ; nine for pretended plots against the king ; and sixty were *starved in prison*, chiefly Carthusian and Franciscan friars, for denying the king's spiritual supremacy. Cranmer all this time, observe, was archbishop of Canterbury.

In fact, it was this opposition to the assumed supremacy of the king in spirituals, by the religious orders, that drew the vengeance of Henry and the reformers upon their establishments. This we learn from the modern editors and Burnet. They say, “ It was well known that the monks and friars, though they complied with the times, [this is *false*, for if they had complied, they would in all probability have been unmolested] yet hated this new power of the king's ; the people were also startled at it : [oh ! then the people were sensible it was something *new*, and something *alarming*, or why startle at it ?] so one Dr. Leighton, who had been in Wolsey's service with Cromwell, proposed a general visitation of all the religious houses in England ; and thought that nothing would reconcile the nation so much as to see some *good effect* from it.” Certainly, the production of *good* was the best way to reconcile the people to the measure ; but, unfortunately for the people of England, *no good whatever* has arisen to them from the usurpation of the supremacy in spirituals by Henry. The good, if such it can be called, fell to the lot of the greedy and unprincipled courtiers, and the evil to the share of the people. There can be no doubt that abuses existed at the time we are speaking of, and that many of the high dignitaries of the church were too well fed, and too rich to do their duty truly ; for if this had not

been the case, the bishops would not have acknowledged the supremacy of Henry, through fear of losing their temporalities, with the exception of one only, namely Fisher, bishop of Rochester. But the *reforming of abuses*, and the *destruction of useful institutions*, are two very distinct things, and the cry of reform was merely a *pretence* to put in execution a diabolical *purpose*. The stoutest opposers of the dissolution, as well as the divorce of Catharine, were the mendicant friars, whose holy poverty kept them independent in mind, and fearless of the threats of death. An example of this heroic fortitude was shewn in the conduct of friars Peto and Elstow, the former of whom boldly preached against the divorce in the presence of Henry, and being attacked in the pulpit by one Dr. Curwin, chaplain to the king, was as strenuously defended by Elstow, who challenged Curwin, before God and all equal judges, to prove him a false prophet and a seducer. This conduct of Elstow was in presence of the king also, nor would he desist in his opposition to Curwin, until the monarch commanded him to be silent. Not many days after the affair took place, Peto and Elstow were ordered to make their appearance before the lords of the council, and, in the conclusion, were sent to prison. Cromwell was present during their examination, and told Elstow that he ought, for his violent behaviour, to have been immediately tied up in a sack, and thrown into the Thames. This observation caused Elstow to smile, and make the following noble reply:—"My lord, be pleased to frighten your court epicures with such menaces as these; men that have lost their courage in their palate, and whose minds are softened with pleasures and vanities. Such as are tied fast to the world, by indulging their senses, may very likely be moved with such kind of threats; but as for us, they make little impression upon us. We esteem it both an honour and merit to suffer upon the occasion, and return thanks to the Almighty, who keeps us steady under the trial. As for your Thames, the road to heaven lies as near by water as by land, and it is indifferent to us whether road we take."

Here we have a proof of the utility of voluntary poverty, inculcated by the religious orders, which makes men fearless of death, and intent only on seeing justice and religion flourish.

Before the dissolution of monasteries in England, twenty-seven abbots, sometimes twenty-nine, sat in the upper house of parliament; to prepare for the devastation, Henry created some close boroughs, whereby he got his creatures returned to ensure a majority, and thus the corruption of parliament was the interlude to the destruction of church property, and the robbery of the poor of their rights. The abbeys which enjoyed the privileges of being represented by their abbots in parliament, were, St. Alban's; Glastenbury; St. Austin's at Canterbury; Westminster, the richest in all England; Winchester, founded by the first Christian king of the West Saxons; St. Edmund's Bury, founded by king Canute; Ely; Abingdon, founded by Cedwella and Ina, kings of the West Saxons; Reading, built by Henry I.; Thorney, in Cambridgeshire; Waltham, founded by Earl Harold, in 1062; St. Peter's, in Gloucester, founded by Wulfere and Etheldred, kings of Mercia; Winchelcomb, in Gloucestershire, founded by Offa and Kenulph, kings of Mercia also; Ramsey, in Huntingdonshire, founded by Ailwyne, alderman of England, and earl of the East-Angles; Bardney, in Lincolnshire. This abbey was demolished by the Danes, in 870, who slew three hundred monks, and was rebuilt by William the Conqueror. Crowland; St. Bennett's, at Hulm, in Norfolk, founded about the year 800; Peterborough, begun by Peada, king of Mercia, in 665, and rebuilt by Adulf, chancellor to king Edgar; Battel, in Sussex, founded by William the Conqueror; Malmesbury, in Wiltshire; Whitby, founded by king Oswy in 657; Selby, in Yorkshire, begun by William the Conqueror; St. Mary's, at York, built in the reign of William Rufus; also Shrewsbury, Cirencester, Evesham, Tavistock, and Hyde at Winchester. Besides these mitred abbeys, two priors had seats in the House of Lords, namely, of Coventry, and of the knights of St. John of Jerusalem.

According to the most exact calculation, at the suppression of the religious houses in England, the sum total of the revenues of the greater monasteries amounted to £104,919; of the lesser, £29,702; of the head house of the knights hospitallers, or of Malta, in London, £2385; of twenty-eight other houses of that order, £3026. The revenues of the clergy were laid at a fourth part of the revenues of the kingdom, in the 27th of Henry VIII., and Mr. Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History, says, that the revenues of the monks never did exceed a fifth part. With these revenues, the poor were not only provided for, churches built, and travellers hospitably entertained, but the church lands contributed to all public burdens, equally with the lands of the laity, while the leases granted by the monks were always on easy rents and small fines. Walsingham and Patrick say, that, in 1379, every mitred abbot paid as much as an earl; and 6s. 8d. for every monk in his monastery. In 1289, a century previous, the abbot of St. Edmund's Bury paid £666 13s. 4d. to the fifteenth granted that year,—an enormous sum if reckoned according to the rate of money at this day. And when we take into consideration that this sum was paid by only *one* abbey, what an immense revenue must have been raised for the exigencies of the state, by the contributions of these institutions throughout the kingdom. The people then were not harassed by the calls of the tax-gatherer, or the distress-warrant of the broker; nor were they subjected to the insults and tyranny of parish-officers, if overwhelmed with pecuniary difficulties; they had only to apply to these mansions of charity, where they were sure to find succour in their distress, and comfort to the wounded mind. If money was required, it was lent without interest; if rest and sustenance, they were bestowed from brotherly love, not wrung from the fear of legal pains and penalties.

It has been fashionable, since what is called the era of the Reformation, to represent the clergy of Catholic times as ignorant, and the people superstitious; but these representations were no other than base devices to cover the deformity

of that horrible fanaticism and worse than savage barbarism which marked the progress of the first pretended reformers' days. The libraries of the monasteries, as we have before stated, were filled with works of literature, and the destruction of these seats of learning and the sciences has been an irreparable loss to the country. Tyrrell, in his History of England, writes:—"From the conversion of the Saxons most of the laws made in the Wittena Gemote, or great councils, were carefully preserved, and would have been conveyed to us more entire, had it not been for the loss of so many curious monuments of antiquity, at the suppression of monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII." How valuable would these records have been in our days as standards of reference for our statesmen, and models of legislation of which, God knows, we stand much in need, when we look at the verbosity of our present acts of parliament, and the shortness and perspicuity of the laws of our ancestors. Then the laws were made so plain that the meanest capacity could understand them; now they are couched in such terms as to bear various constructions, and in many instances it has been recorded in the public papers that one magistrate will define a law in a very different sense to what another will, and each act upon his own construction. Even the libraries of the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge were not spared in the gothic rage displayed by the visitors and reformers of imputed monastic abuses. At Oxford there were two most noble public libraries, the one founded by Richard of Burg, or Richard Aungerville, lord treasurer of England and bishop of Durham in the reign of Edward III., who spared no cost or pains, and he was a *bishop* be it remembered, to render this collection complete; the other was furnished with books by Thomas Cobham, bishop of Worcester in 1367, which were greatly augmented by the munificence of Henry IV., his sons, and by the addition of the library of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, filled with many curious manuscripts from foreign parts. Of the fate of this last library, Mr. Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History, says, "These books were many



of them plated with gold and silver, and curiously embossed. *This*, as far as we can guess, *was the superstition* which destroyed them. Here avarice had a very thin disguise, and the courtiers discovered of what spirit they were to a very remarkable degree.....Merton college had almost a cart load of manuscripts carried off and thrown away to the most scandalous uses.....This was a strange inquisition upon sense and reason, and showed that they intended to seize the superstitious foundations, and *reform them to nothing*. The universities languished in their studies the remainder of this reign, and were remarkable for nothing, but some trifling performances in poetry and grammar." The same author writes, "The books instead of being removed to royal libraries, to those of cathedrals, or the universities, were frequently thrown into the grantees, as things of slender consideration. Now oftentimes these men proved a very ill protection for learning and antiquity. Their avarice was sometimes so mean, and their ignorance so undistinguishing, that when the covers were somewhat rich, and would yield a little, they pulled them off, threw away the books, or turned them to waste-paper. Thus many noble libraries were destroyed." He further observes, that John Bale, sometime bishop of Ireland, "a man remarkably averse to Popery and the monastic institution," gives this lamentable account of what he himself was an eye witness to:—"I know a merchant (who shall at this time be nameless) that bought the contents of two noble libraries for forty shillings a piece; a shame it is to be spoken. This stuff has been used instead of grey paper by the space of more than these ten years. A prodigious example this, and to be abhorred of all men who love their nation as they should do. Yea, what may bring our realm to more shame, than to have it noised abroad, that we are despisers of learning? I judge this to be true, and utter it with heaviness, that neither the Britons under the Romans and Saxons, nor yet the English people under the Danes and Normans, had ever such damage of their learned monuments as we have seen in our time." (*John Bale's Declaration on*

*Leland's Journal*, an. 1549.) Fuller, too, has borne testimony to the devastating spirit of the reformers in those days. He breaks out into a passionate declamation on the occasion, and complains, "that all arts and sciences fell under the common calamity. How many admirable manuscripts of the fathers, schoolmen, and commentators were destroyed by these means? What number of historians of all ages and countries? The holy scriptures themselves, as much as the gossellers pretended to regard them, underwent the fate of the rest. If a book had a cross upon it, it was condemned for Popery; and those with lines and circles were interpreted the black arts, and destroyed for conjuring. And thus (he adds) divinity was profaned, mathematics suffered for corresponding with evil spirits, physic was maimed, and riot committed on the law itself." We shall produce one testimony more. Chamberlain, in his *Present State of England*, thus describes the havoc committed by the vandalic reformers, headed by Cranmer and Cromwell:—"These men, under pretence of rooting out Popery, superstition, and idolatry, utterly destroyed these two noble libraries, and embezzled, sold, burnt, or tore in pieces all those valuable books which those great patrons of learning had been so diligent in procuring in every country of Europe. Nay, their fury was so successful as to the Aungervillian library, which was the oldest, largest, and choicest, that we have not so much as a catalogue of the books left. Nor did they rest here. They visited likewise the college libraries, and one may guess at the work they made with them, by a letter still kept in the archives, where one of them boasts, that New-College quadrangle was all covered with the leaves of their torn books, &c. The university thought fit to complain to the government of this barbarity and covetousness of the visitors, but could not get any more by it than one single book, given to the library by John Whethamstead, the learned abbot of St. Alban's, wherein is contained part of Valerius Maximus, with the commentaries of Dionysius de Burgo; and to this day there is no book in the Bodleian library besides this and two more

which are certainly known to have belonged to either of the former libraries. Nay, and the university itself, despairing ever to enjoy any other public library, thought it advisable to dispose of the very desks and shelves the books stood on, in the year 1555." Enough is here related to make the cheek of a Protestant redden with shame, and cause him to forbear in future from charging the calumniated monks with ignorance and idleness.

The *Book of Martyrs* tells us that there were debates going on in the convocation concerning the different opinions which were found to be spreading in the kingdom, of which the lower house made a complaint to the upper house of no less than sixty-seven, in that early period of the king's supremacy. Of these opinions we shall have occasion to say something by and by; we must confine ourselves at present to the dissolution of the monasteries. On this head the book says, "At this time visitors were appointed to survey all the lesser monasteries: they were to examine the state of their revenues and goods, and take inventories of them, and to take their seals into their keeping; they were to try how many of the religious would return to a secular course of life; and these were to be sent to the archbishop of Canterbury, or the lord chancellor, and an allowance was to be given them for their journey; but those who intended to continue in that state were to be removed to some of the great monasteries. A pension was also to be assigned to the abbot or prior during life; and the visitors were particularly to examine what leases had been made during the last year. Ten thousand of the religious were by this means driven to seek for their livings, with forty shillings and a gown a man. Their goods and plate were estimated at £100,000 and the valued rents of their houses was £32,000; but they were above ten times as much. The churches and cloisters were in most places pulled down, and the materials sold."

Here then we have it admitted that Cranmer, the first Protestant primate of England, took a conspicuous part in the work of spoliation and robbery. It is also confessed that

*ten thousand* of these innocent and useful class of men were turned out of their peaceful habitations into the wide world, to seek a living wherever they could, with only forty shillings and a gown a man. The churches and cloisters in which many of them dwelt were pulled down and sold, and the proceeds went to enrich some base and hungry courtier, for his readiness to pander to the beastly vices of an unfeeling and depraved monarch. These doings, however, we are told, gave great discontent to the people; and who can wonder at it? So to remove this discontent, Burnet writes, that “Cromwell advised the king to *sell these lands* (belonging to the monks) at very easy rates, to the *nobility* and *gentry*, and to *oblige* them to keep up the wonted hospitality. This (he intimated) would both be grateful to them, and would engage them to *assist the crown in the maintenance of* THE CHANGES *that had been made, since their own interests* would be *interwoven* with those of *their sovereign*.” Such was the advice of Cromwell, the blacksmith’s son, and from this counsel we may date the division of England into parties, whereby the people have lost a great portion of their civil privileges, and a boroughmongering faction has been established in the room of the once free parliaments of the country. The degree of hospitality shewn by the new possessors of the lands of the hospitable monks we may gather from Dr. Heylin, who in his *History of the Reformation*, speaking of the sacrilegious devastations carried on by Cranmer and the courtiers of Edward VI., writes, “But bad examples seldom end where they first began. For the nobility and inferior gentry possessed of patronages, considered how much the lords and great men of the court had improved their fortunes by the suppression of those chantries, and other foundations which had been granted to the king, conceived themselves in a capacity of doing the like, by taking into their hands the yearly profits of those benefices, of which by law they only were entrusted with the presentations. Of which abuse complaint is made by bishop Latimer, in his printed sermons, in which we find, ‘That the gentry of that time invaded the

profits of the church; leaving the tithe only to the incumbent:’ and ‘That chantry-priests were put by them into several cures, to save their pensions,’ (p. 38); that ‘many benefices were let out in fee-farms,’ (p. 71); ‘or given unto servants for keeping of hounds, hawks, and horses, and for making of gardens,’ (pp. 91, 114); and finally, ‘That the poor clergy, being kept to some sorry pittances, were forced to put themselves into gentlemen’s houses, and there to serve as clerks of the kitchen, surveyors, receivers,’ &c. (p. 241). All which enormities (though tending so apparently to the dishonour of God, the disservice of the church, and the disgrace of religion) were generally connived at by the lords and others, who only had the power to reform the same, because they could not question those who had so miserably invaded the church’s patrimony, without condemning of themselves.” That the interests of these receivers of stolen property were interwoven with the interests of their sovereign, or, in other words, that they considered it their interest to have a sovereign of the same disposition as themselves, is clear from the records of history. On the death of Edward, the faction attempted to set aside the right of Mary, a Catholic princess, in favour of Jane Grey, who had no claim whatever to the crown, and the same faction occasioned James the Second, another Catholic sovereign, to abdicate the throne, because he sought to establish freedom of conscience for all.

Under such circumstances it is not surprising that the discontents of the people should increase, which was the case, until at length they broke out into open rebellion. The account given by Burnet of this resistance on the part of the people is in part true, and in other parts false. The insurrection commenced in the north, where the people retained a strong feeling in favour of the ancient faith, and the clergy were removed from the influence of the court. Every succeeding innovation produced increased discontent. The people had looked with reverence from their childhood on the monastic establishments, from which they had experienced so much kindness and affection, and could not behold the ruin



of these institutions without irritation and grief. To see the monks driven from their houses, and compelled, in most instances, to beg their bread ; to behold the poor, who were formerly fed at the doors of the convents, now abandoned to despair and hunger, excited the indignation of the people, who flew to arms, to demand a redress of these grievances. " They complained chiefly," writes Dr. Lingard, " of the suppression of the monasteries, of the statutes of uses, of the introduction of such men as Cromwell and Rich, and of the preferment in the church of the archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin, and of the bishops of Rochester, Salisbury, and St. David's, whose chief aim was to subvert the church." Others of the insurgents required, the same writer says, " that heretical books should be suppressed, and that heretical bishops (alluding probably to Cranmer and his party) and temporal men of their sect, should either be punished according to law, or try their quarrel with the pilgrims (the insurgents had taken the name of the pilgrims of grace) by battle : that the statutes which abolished the papal authority, bastardized the princess Mary, suppressed the monasteries, and gave to the king the tenths and first fruits of benefices, should be repealed : that Cromwell, the vicar general, Audley, the lord chancellor, and Rich, the attorney general, should be punished *as subverters of the law*, and maintainers of heresy : that Lee and Layton, the visitors of the northern monasteries, should be prosecuted *for extortion, peculation*, and other abominable acts : and that a parliament should be shortly held at some convenient place, as Nottingham or York." These terms were rejected ; but, after some negotiation, an unlimited pardon was offered and accepted, with an understanding that the grievances complained of should be shortly discussed in a parliament to be holden at York ; but, with true Protestant magnanimity, the royal pope of England, as soon as he was freed from his apprehensions, did not think proper to keep his promise, and the parliament was never called. Two months after, the pilgrims were again in arms, but were defeated in their measures, their leaders were taken and sent to

London to be executed, and others were hanged by scores at York, Hull, and Carlisle.

This was the only forcible opposition that Henry experienced in his designs upon the liberties of the church of England, which had been of so long standing, and were secured by the Charter. Of this insurrection, Mr. Collier thus speaks: "If resistance of the chief magistrate had been justifiable in any case, those who appeared in arms upon the dissolution of monasteries had a strong colour for their undertaking. For were not the old landmarks set aside, and the constitution newly modelled? For do not the liberties and immunities of the church stand in the front of Magna Charta? and are they not particularly secured in the first place? Was not the king's coronation oath lamentably strained, when he signed the dissolution act? For had he not sworn to guard the property of his subjects? to protect the religious? and maintain them in the legal establishment? The ancient nobility were thrown out of the patronage of their monasteries, lost their corrodies, and the privilege of their ancestors' benefactions. The rents were raised, and the poor forgotten, as they complained, by the new proprietors. Besides, they were afraid their friends in another world might suffer by these alienations, and the dead fare worse for want of the prayers of the living. Granting therefore the matter of fact, that the prosecutions were legal, which way are the abbots more to be blamed (who rose in the north) than the barons who took up arms in defence of liberty and property, and appeared in the field against king John and Henry III.? The abbeyes, without question, had all the securities the civil magistrate could give them; no estate could be better guarded by the laws. Magna Charta, as I observed, was made particularly in favour of these foundations, and confirmed at the beginning of every parliament for many succeeding reigns. These things considered, we must of necessity either condemn the barons, or acquit the monks, and justify the northern rebellion."

From these facts it may be discovered that Cranmer and his vile associates, though they could keep in favour with a

brutal monarch, by catering to his passions, and dissembling their own views, were by no means popular with the people of England. We have always contended that the people generally are on the side of virtue and justice, and though we have seen acts of injustice sanctioned by popular assemblies, yet they have always been done with a view (erroneous certainly) of punishing those who were supposed to have been the betrayers of their country, and the violators of the laws of society. Till this period England had been a truly free and happy country, and the office of judge was almost a sinecure. When the reformers meditated their designs on the church, they began by calumniating the clergy and deceiving the people; but, notwithstanding, when facts developed the baseness of their conduct, the multitude, we see, became sensible of their error, and called for the punishment of the betrayers of their country's welfare. But power is sometimes, and we will say too frequently, an overmatch for justice; and the complaints of the people are too often disregarded, through the interests of courtiers. So it was in this case; though Cranmer and Cromwell, and the rest of the corrupt gang, were hated by the people, they nevertheless continued in office, and converted the once happy England into a great slaughter house. New crimes were created, and new penalties enacted; men were put to death without being arraigned or heard in their defence, or even without any direct charge against them, and the jails were filled to suffocation with persons arrested on suspicion only. Hitherto, the system of spoliation had been confined to the lesser monasteries, and it was supposed by some that the dangerous insurrection which had been quelled would have induced Henry to stay his hand and preserve the greater monasteries in their rights. This he had promised the nobility and gentry in the north, before they consented to lay down their arms. But the king having nothing now to apprehend from the insurgents, the seizure of the great monasteries was resolved upon, and the same means were resorted to as before to deceive the people. Rumours of an invasion by France were set afloat, and that,

as heavy taxes would be the natural consequence to meet the invaders, the seizure of the monasteries would be a better expedient, inasmuch as their revenues would defray all the expenses, and be a great easement to the people. These and such like specious pretences were found to be necessary now, because the charges of immorality could not be put forth, the character of the religious being established by the very act of parliament that dissolved the lesser convents. Therefore management and mystery must be resorted to, and how well they were practised the reader has seen in the account we quoted from Sir Wm. Dugdale. Suffice it to say, that by stratagem and device, the commissioners, in about two years time, demolished the monuments of British, Saxon, and Norman glory, which, for above one thousand years, had given undeniable proofs of virtue and had been the fountains of learning and the arts.

To give an exact number of the religious houses thus demolished is a matter of difficulty. Mr. Camden states them at 645 in England and Wales ; but a list taken out of the court of first fruits and tenths makes them 754. The annual revenue of these religious houses was computed at 135,522*l.* 18*s.* 10*d.*, and the moveable goods were, it may be said, incalculable. To this list we have to add 90 colleges, 2374 chantries and free chapels, and 110 hospitals, which met with the same fate. Sir Robert Atkyns says, there were in England, before the Reformation, 45,009 churches, and 55,000 chapels, from which we may judge of the piety of our ancestors in Catholic times, and the great share of employment that was given to the people by the erection of these temples to the worship of God, many of which were of the most beautiful structure and workmanship, and give a flat denial to the foul sneers so lavishly thrown out, by the vain conceited Protestants of these days, of the darkness and ignorance of those ages. Of these the greater part were destroyed by the ruthless hands of the pretended reformers of religion, and time has nearly decayed the remainder. Though the abbey lands were granted to the king to be applied to the benefit of the

nation, but few of them went into the exchequer, the greater part being distributed amongst his favourites and partners in guilt. Thus a new race of upstarts sprung up to beard the ancient nobility of the king, and to this work of spoliation and sacrilege do many of the present noble families of this kingdom owe their origin and wealth. Of these we may name the families of Russell, Cavendish, and Powlet. To give some idea of the manner in which these possessions of the church were disposed of, Stow relates, that he (Henry) made a grant to a gentlewoman of a religious house, for presenting him with a dish of puddings, which happened to please his palate; that he paid away many a thousand a year belonging to the monasteries, and particularly that Jesus' bells belonging to a steeple not far from St. Paul's, London, very remarkable both for their size and music, were lost at one throw to Sir Miles Partridge. Many other of the ancient places of the divine worship were turned into tippling houses, stables, and dog kennels, while others, as we have before observed, were left a heap of ruins, which made Sir William Davenant complain of this havoc in the following elegant lines:—

“ Who sees these dismal heaps, but will demand,  
What barbarous invader sack'd the land ?  
But when he hears no Goth, no Turk did bring  
This desolation, but a Christian king—  
When nothing but the name of zeal appears  
'Twixt our best actions, and the worst of theirs,  
What does he think our sacrilege would spare,  
Since these th' effects of our devotions are ?”

Having described the manner in which the monastic institutions fell by the hands of a barbarian king and his villanous courtiers, we will conclude by drawing a brief contrast between the situation of the country, when these institutions flourished, and the present days of enlightened wisdom, as they are termed. But first, it may not be amiss to give a slight sketch of the *early* consequences of this work of destruction. The lure held out to the people to reconcile them to the project of



a general dissolution was, that by the king's taking the revenue of these establishments into his own hands, he would be able to maintain an army of 40,000 well trained soldiers, with skilful captains and commanders, without calling upon his subjects for subsidies, fifteenths, loans, and other common aids. But no sooner did he get possession of the lands and revenues of the monks, than he called upon the people for subsidies and loans, and received them against the law. The first step taken, on the passing of the act of parliament to dissolve the monasteries, was the appointment of a *Court of Augmentation*, to manage the revenues accruing to the crown by the dissolution; and well did the members of this court manage the business for their own interest, as Fuller tells us, in his Church History, that "the officers of the court were many, their pensions great, crown profits thereby very small, and causes there defending few; so that it was not worth the while to keep up a mill to grind that grist where the toll would not quit cost." But though this Protestant historian held this opinion, the reformers were of another, for they continued to "keep up the mill" during a space of eighteen years, chiefly for the benefit of the clerks, &c., and it was not stopped grinding the public till the first year of Mary I., better known by the name of "bloody queen Mary," because she was a Catholic princess, and governed her subjects according to the ancient laws of the land. While the courtiers were thus feeding their own nest, every other order of men in every station of life felt the heavy weight of this calamitous event. Nobility and gentry, rich and poor, young and old, clergy and laity, the ignorant and the learned, the living and the dead, were alike sufferers, and experienced numerous miseries flowing from it. In the same parliament that gave the king the great and rich priory of St. John of Jerusalem, (the last that was seized upon, because the only one left to be seized), a subsidy from both laity and clergy was demanded. Sir Richard Baker says, in his *Chronicle*, "In his one and thirtieth year, a subsidy of two shillings in the pound of lands, and twelve of goods, with four fifteens, were granted

to the king, towards his charges of making bulwarks. In his five and thirtieth year, a subsidy was granted, to be paid in three years, every Englishman being worth in goods twenty shillings and upwards to five pounds, to pay four pence of every pound ; and from five pounds to ten pounds, eight-pence ; and from ten pounds to twenty pounds, twelve pence ; from twenty pounds and upwards, of every pound two shillings : strangers, as well denizens as others, being inhabitants, to pay double. And for lands, every Englishman paid eight pence of the pound, from twenty shillings to five pounds ; and from five pounds to ten pounds, sixteen pence ; and from ten pounds to twenty pounds, two shillings ; and from twenty pounds and upwards, of every pound three shillings ; strangers double. The clergy six shillings in the pound, of benefices ; and every priest having no benefice, but an annual stipend, six shillings and eight pence yearly, during three years." The same writer tells us that "In his six and thirtieth year, proclamation was made for the enhancing of gold to eight and forty shillings, and silver to four shillings, the ounce ; also he caused to be coined base money, mingling it with brass, which was, since that time, called down the fifth year of Edward VI., and called in the second year of queen Elizabeth." Such were the consequences to the country immediately following the baneful measure ; we will now proceed to a detail of the more remote results.

The spoils of the church and the lands of the monasteries were not appropriated to the benefit of the people, but were distributed amongst the favourites and panderers of Henry, and subsequently, that is in the reign of the boy-pope, his successor, Edward VI., amongst the hirelings of the ruling factions which alternately governed the young monarch. These creatures were not selected for their attachment to the principles of the constitution, and their love of rational freedom, though they had the cry of "Liberty" constantly in their mouths ; but the possessions they obtained were the recompense, from a bloody and merciless tyrant, for the villanous services which they performed to gratify his in-

satiable lust and brutal passions. They were the dross of the nation, famed only for their vices and villany, and thus they became the bane and scourge of the unhappy people of England. Conscious of the illegal tenure of their property, and fearful that a knowledge of the truth might oblige them to disgorge the property thus unjustly obtained, the possessors thereof raised themselves into a party, the grand principle of which was intolerance and fraud. Thus, whenever a disposition was shewn to favour the Catholics of this country, false reports and unjust accusations were immediately circulated to inflame the minds of the ignorant, and conspiracies were forged to alarm the timid. The gunpowder plot in James I.'s reign, and Oate's plot in Charles II.'s, had no other foundation than the intrigues of this party to keep alive the embers of religious fanaticism, and thus prevent the public mind from discerning the evils preying upon the country. The wishes of James II to establish liberty of conscience for all his subjects again alarmed the party, and in the end, being a Catholic, he was driven from the throne. The reign of his successor, William III., was one of war for the safety of the Protestant interest, and in support of it the national debt was commenced, the weight of which is now become insupportable.

We will now proceed to contrast the benefits derived to the country from the monasteries, with the miseries the people now endure from the want of them. In the first place, the convents both of men and women were schools of learning and piety, and were therefore of the greatest service to the education of children. In every monastic institution one or more persons were assigned for the purpose of teaching; and thus the children of the neighbourhood, both rich and poor, were taught grammar and music, without any charge to their parents, and in the nunneries, the female children were instructed in the useful branches of housewifery. Now, however, the case is altered. In those endowed schools, which bear the name of charity, interest must be used to get the children admitted, and though there are some supported

by voluntary contributions, yet it can be considered in no other light than a tax, which many pay from *fear*, and others from ostentation.

In the second place, the monasteries were, in effect, great hospitals, where the poor were relieved and nursed in the time of distress and sickness ; and they were likewise houses of entertainment for travellers of all ranks. From their revenues they provided with a liberal hand for the wants of others, while their own diet was slender and frugal. Then we had no assessment upon parishes to relieve the indigent ; now we have upwards of eight millions sterling, levied upon the land and trade, to supply the poor with but half a sufficiency, and indeed scarcely that. Then the poor fared sumptuously, the villagers were happy and cheerful, their hours were spent in paying homage to God, labouring for their families, and harmlessly enjoying themselves over a plenteous board of meat and nut brown ale. Now the labourer is scarcely able to procure even bread for his family, and in most cases, he has to apply to the parish for relief ; there he meets with the surly growl of the overseer, instead of the smiling welcome of the cowled monk, and is too often sent away with a refusal of assistance ; instead of the plump and florid countenance of the rural swain, we see nothing but pallid and emaciated figures, pining in sorrow and care, or totally regardless of that noble feeling of independence which marked the peasantry of ancient days. Then the population were chiefly employed in agricultural pursuits and the different branches of trade connected with the land, and the monks being the best landlords, a little colony was sure to spring up near a monastery ; now the people are congregated in large towns, and employed in great manufactories, whereby their morals are corrupted and their health injured, while the profits of their labour go to enrich perhaps one individual, whose property is already immense, and applied probably only to his own individual gratification.

Thirdly, the nobility and gentry had, by means of the monasteries, a creditable mode of providing for their younger

children and old servants. Now they are fastened upon the nation in the way of pensions, places, the half-pay list, and such like devices, by which they live out of the sweat of the poor, whereas in Catholic times they contributed to the comfort of the poor, by being their instructors, physicians and nurses.

Fourthly, the monasteries were of the greatest advantage to the commonwealth, inasmuch as they not only contributed to preserve the dignity of the crown and the rights of the people, but they had services reserved by their founders, which were of a military nature, but widely different from a standing army. For example, the abbeys that held by knights' service, were bound to provide such a number of soldiers as their services required, and furnish them for the field at their own charge. Thus, when the country called, their men appeared at their musters, to attend the heirs of the founders, or such as had settled a knight's fee upon them. Here then we had an army equipped at a moment's notice, to support the honour of old England, and without a tittle of tax upon the people. Now, however, we are compelled to employ recruiting officers and men at a heavy charge; individuals are bought or trepanned into the service; a large sum of money is annually wrung out of the sweat of the poor to maintain this army; and in the event of its being reduced, the officers are saddled upon the nation for life, so that one part of the people may be said to live upon the labour of the other; whereas in Catholic times, in the absence of debt, loans, pensions, sinecures, taxes, and tax-gatherers, every class of the community was usefully employed, and each contributed to the other's comfort.

When Henry VIII. came to the crown, he found his exchequer well filled. The nation was without debt and the people content and happy. In this state he reigned over them nearly twenty years, when the passion of lust first turned him from the path of duty, and he became an inexorable tyrant. In this raging temper he was surrounded by men of the vilest qualities, who fanned the flame of his desires to



an ungovernable fury, and by the most deceptive arts led him to sanction the most disgraceful outrages, while they took care to profit by the villanies they projected. But as the vengeance of God fell on the persecutors of the primitive Christians, so did his justice fall on the evil doers in the work of devastation we have just described. Harry, who, as the head and supreme in these horrible sacrileges, demands the first notice, after living a voluptuous life, grew so corpulent and unwieldy that he was not able to go up stairs, or from one room to another, but was obliged to be hoisted up by an engine; his body too was filled with foul and nauseous humours, which caused such a stench as made it loathsome to attend upon him. In his dying illness he affected some religious compunction, but no one gave credit to his actions, and he who had made so many men's wills void, had his own totally disregarded by those who had been his greatest favourites. He died unregretted, and his memory is only held in remembrance to execrate the bloody deeds which stain his life. Dr. Heylin records that "he never spared woman in his lust, nor man in his anger;" and Sir Walter Raleigh says of him, "That if all the patterns of a merciless prince had been lost in the world, they might have been found in this king." Of his six wives, the memory of one only is held in veneration by posterity; this is the unfortunate, but magnanimous Catharine, whose cruel persecution has been dearly paid for by the nation. His second wife, Anne Boleyn, who was instrumental in the sufferings of Catharine, was beheaded for incest with her own brother; the third, Jane Seymour, being in childbirth and in danger of death, as well as the child, had her body ripped up by order of the king to preserve the child; the fourth, Anne of Cleves, was cast off within two or three months; the fifth, Catharine Howard, was beheaded for adultery; and the sixth, Catharine Parr, was near sharing the same fate, but had the good fortune to escape and survive him.

We must now say a word or two on Cromwell, who was a principal actor in this tragedy of depredation and cruelty.

This creature of crime and violence had risen so high in royal favour, that he seemed to engross all the power and influence of the court. He obtained a grant of thirty manors belonging to the suppressed monasteries, the title of earl of Essex was conferred upon him, and he was appointed to the office of lord chamberlain, in addition to his situation of vicar general, and other trusts. In this sunshine of court patronage he conducted the business of the crown in parliament, and thought himself omnipotent. Indeed so little did he apprehend the fate that awaited him, that he actually committed the bishop of Chichester and Dr. Wilson to the Tower, on a charge of having *relieved* prisoners confined for refusing the oath of supremacy; and threatened with the royal displeasure the duke of Norfolk, and the bishops of Durham, Winchester, and Bath, who were opposed to his views, when he suddenly found himself the object of the king's anger. Henry, it will be recollected, had taken a dislike to Anne of Cleves, his fourth wife, and he learned that Cromwell had been the prime negotiator in this disagreeable match. Hence, he contracted as violent a dislike to his favourite as he had entertained a strong partiality for him, and he was not slow in wreaking his vengeance. The butchering vicar-general seems not to have had the least suspicion of his fall, until he found himself, after he attended the house of lords in the morning, and the council board in the afternoon, on the 10th of June, 1540, arrested and taken to the Tower on a charge of high treason. As minister, he was accused of receiving bribes and encroaching on the royal authority by issuing commissions, pardoning convicts, and granting licences for the exportation of prohibited merchandize. As vicar-general, he was charged with having betrayed his duty, by not only holding heretical opinions himself, but also by protecting heretical preachers. And to make him a traitor, he was accused of having expressed a resolution to fight against the king, if it were necessary, in support of his *religious* opinions. He was confronted with his accusers in presence of the commissioners, but was refused the benefit of a public trial before

•

his peers. He was proceeded against by a bill of attainder, of which he had no reason, however, to complain, as he was the first to employ the iniquitous measure against others. The modern editors of the Book of Martyrs, copying from Burnet, say, "Cromwell experienced the common fate of fallen ministers; his pretended friends forsook him, and his enemies pursued their revenge against him without opposition, except from Cranmer, who, with a *rare fidelity*, dared to avow an attachment to him, even at this time, and wrote a very earnest letter to the king in his favour. But Henry was not easily turned from his purpose, and being resolved on the ruin of Cromwell, was not to be dissuaded from his design." Cranmer did, to be sure, interpose in behalf of his friend and compeer in villany, but he took care to use such measured language, that the king could not take offence, for Tom was very careful to keep his own skin whole as long as he could. His epistle rather enumerated the past services of Cromwell than defended his innocence, as the following extract will shew:—"A man," writes Cranmer, "that was so advanced by your majesty, whose surety was only by your majesty, who loved your majesty no less than God [what blasphemy!], who studied always to set forward whatsoever was your majesty's will and pleasure, who cared for no man's displeasure to serve your majesty, who was such a servant, in my judgment, in wisdom, diligence, faithfulness, and experience, as no prince in this realm ever had the like; who was so vigilant to preserve your majesty from all treasons, that few could be so secretly conceived but he detected the same in the beginning; such a man, that, if the noble princes of inemory, king John, Henry II., Richard II., had had such a counsellor about them, I suppose they would never have been so treacherously abandoned and overthrown, as those good princes were. Who shall your grace trust hereafter, if you mistrust him? Alas! I bewail and lament your grace's chance herein: I wot not whom your grace may trust," &c. Such was the character given by Cranmer of his friend Cromwell; yet five days after this pattern of "*rare fidelity*" had thus addressed his majesty, this very Tom Cranmer, this Pro-

testant archbishop of Canterbury, this prime reformer of the church of England, on the second and third readings of the bill of attainder, gave his vote *in favour of it*, thinking it safer to go with the stream than contend against the tide of Harry's will. Oh ! blessed Tom Cranmer. In consequence of Tom's compliance, the bill passed the lords without a dissentient voice, and probably with as little opposition through the commons. The bill was no sooner passed, than the prisoner was led out and beheaded on Tower-hill a few days after he was arrested.

Thus fell the great favourite of Henry, whom he made use of to do his dirty work, and who was too ready, it cannot be denied, to perform the task set him. In the fall of this man there were three singular circumstances attending his fate. Though appointed vicar-general to the head of the church, with a power to reform all heresies, he was accused of heresy himself. Again, although he had, in his life-time, been the greatest destroyer of the church of all the innovators of that age, yet, in his dying speech, he declared himself a stanch Catholic. "I pray you," says he, "that be here, to bear me record, I die in the Catholic faith, not doubting in any article of my faith ; no, nor doubting in any sacrament of the church. Many have slandered me, and reported that I have been a hearer of such as have maintained evil opinions, which is untrue ; but I confess, that like as God, by his Holy Spirit, doth instruct us in the truth, so the devil is ready to seduce us, and I have been seduced : but bear me witness, I die of the faith of the Catholic church." Next, he fell by a law of his own framing, the most odious and diabolical that could be devised, and intended to revenge himself of those individuals who had the courage and honesty to oppose his infamous practices. We find in Dodd's account of the life of this monster in human shape, the following singular relation of his posterity :—"I meet with a pedigree of this family," writes this historian, "which makes the infamous Oliver Cromwell a branch of it, in the following manner : Lord Cromwell, son to the earl of Essex, dying without issue male, a daughter of

the family was married to one Morgan Williams, of Glamorganshire, whose son, Sir Richard Williams, took the name of Cromwell, and settled in Huntingdonshire, from whom descended Sir Oliver Cromwell, knight of the Bath in king James I.'s reign, who had a younger brother called Robert, father to Oliver the protector. Now, if this pedigree may be depended upon, it is very remarkable how fatal the name has been both to church and state, both to Catholics and Protestants. About a hundred years after Thomas Cromwell had stripped the church of Rome of monastic lands, Oliver carried on the Reformation, and stripped the church of England of bishops' lands. Now, to draw a parallel of their irreligious proceedings, there seems to be some resemblance both as to their motives and methods, and Catholics may be in hopes of being pitied under their oppression; for altering the date of years, the same apology will serve for both churches."

Such was the fate of Cromwell, who fell unpitied by his friends and despised by the people; nor was he the only example of God's vengeance on the cruel and remorseless destroyers of the pious monuments and charitable institutions of their religious forefathers. The instances of the resentment of Heaven at the injuries done to church property and the rights of the poor were numerous and awful. The monastic institutions were chiefly designed to revive the piety of the primitive Christians, and promote the great end of charity. We have seen how well they performed the task, and the many benefits they conferred upon those nations that fostered them, but especially on England, as regarded religion, the sciences, and civil freedom. The destruction of these institutions was the death blow of England's liberties and happiness; but the perpetrators fell in the vortex of ruin they had prepared for the church. The abbey lands, which were seized to gratify the avarice and cupidity of courtiers, became the curse of the families who alienated them from their lawful owners. The effect of this curse was so visible, that, within twenty years after the dissolution, more of the nobility were attainted and died under the sword of justice, than suffered



in that way from the Conquest to the devastation, making a period of 500 years. To give the work an appearance of legality, the sanction of parliament was obtained by corrupting the members; and see the consequences which followed. Mr. Fuller, in his Church History, c. vi., writes, "If you examine the list of the barons in the parliament of the 27th of Henry VIII., you will find very few of them whose sons do, at this day, inherit their fathers' titles and estates; and of these few, many to whom the king's favour hath restored what the rigorous law of attainder took, both dignity, lands, and posterity. And, doubtless, the commons have drunk deeply of this cup of deadly wine; but they, being more numerous and less eminent, are not so obvious to observation. However, it will not be amiss to insert the observation of a most worthy antiquarian, Sir Henry Spelman, in the county where he was born, and best experienced; who reporteth that, in Norfolk, there were 100 houses of gentlemen, before the dissolution, possessed of fair estates, of whom so many as gained accession by abbey lands are at this time extinct, or much impaired, bemoaning his own family, under the latter notion, as diminished by such an addition." That Norfolk, our native county, was not alone marked with the finger of God, may be traced by history, for it will be found that every county throughout England bore the same visible marks of God's signal displeasure of this work of sacrilege and spoliation.

#### DEBATES OF THE CONVOCATION.

Having shewn how the temporalities of the church fell a prey to the avaricious designs of the panders of Henry, it is now time to take some notice of the theological proceedings which took place among Henry's divines, while the work of robbery and sacrilege was going on. The king, it will be observed, had caused himself to be acknowledged by the clergy and parliament, the supreme head of the church of England, and consigned many of the most virtuous and learned men, such as Fisher, More, Forrest, and others, to the fagot and the block, for refusing to acknowledge this su-

premacv in him, so far as spirituals were concerned. Having submitted to his supreme headship, the clergy, in convocation, obsequiously became the mere tools of the royal lay-pope. A convocation is an assembly of the clergy for consultation upon matters ecclesiastical, and in this country consisted of two distinct houses, like the parliament; the archbishops and bishops constituted the upper house, and the inferior clergy, represented by deputies, forming the lower house. Previous to the Reformation, as it is called, this assembly was uninfluenced by royal power, as the church was secured in her privileges by Magna Charta, and in return was highly instrumental in securing to the people their privileges enjoyed under the same charter. To bring the matter about, Henry had got all the clergy into a *premunire*, whereby they had forfeited all their temporal possessions to the king, and were in danger of being sent to prison at the king's pleasure. When the statutes of *premunire* were passed, a power was given to the sovereign to mitigate or suspend their operation, and hence it was customary for the king to grant letters of license or protection to particular individuals. Wolsey held one of these patents under the great seal for fifteen years, during which no one ever accused him of violating the law. When the cardinal was indicted for the offence, for some reason or other he neglected or refused to plead the royal permission, and suffered judgment to pass against him, and it was argued, on the ground of his conviction, that all the clergy were liable to the same penalty, because, by admitting his jurisdiction, they had become partners in his guilt. Accordingly, the attorney-general, to their consternation, was instructed to file an information against the whole in the court of king's bench. To get out of this predicament, into which they had fallen, the clergy of the province of Canterbury hastily assembled in convocation, and tendered to the king a present of one hundred thousand pounds in return for a full pardon. Henry, however, under the advice of Cromwell, through whose cunning the bishops and clergy had been caught in the snare, to their great grief and astonishment, refused the proposal,

unless they at the same time consented to acknowledge him, the king, "to be the protector and *only* supreme head of the church and clergy of England." Three days were consumed in useless consultation, and conferences were held with Cromwell and the royal commissioners. In the course of the debates, bishop Fisher, who appeared to be almost the only individual of the clergy that had the courage to speak the sentiments of his mind, and oppose, as far as he was able, the irreligious innovation meditated by Henry, delivered his sentiments in the following terms: "My lords, it is true, we are all under the king's lash, and stand in need of the king's good favour and clemency; yet this argues not that we should therefore do that which will render us both ridiculous and contemptible to all the christian world, and hissed out from the society of God's holy Catholic church: for, what good will that be to us, to keep the possession of our houses, cloisters, and convents, and to lose the society of the Christian world; to preserve our goods, and lose our consciences? Wherefore, my lords, I pray let us consider what we do, and what it is we are to grant; the dangers and inconveniences that will ensue thereupon; or whether it lies in our power to grant what the king requireth at our hands, or whether the king be an apt person to receive this; that so we may go groundedly to work, and not like men that had lost all honesty and wit together with their worldly fortune. As concerning the first point, viz., what the supremacy of the church is, which we are to give unto the king; it is to exercise the spiritual government of the church in chief; which, according to all that ever I have learned, both in the gospel and through the whole course of divinity, mainly consists in these two points:—

"1. In loosing and binding sinners; according to that which our Saviour said unto St. Peter, when he ordained him head of his church, viz., 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' Now, my lords, can we say unto the king, *tibi*, to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven? If you say ay, where is your warrant? if you

say no, then you have answered yourselves, that you cannot put such keys into his hands.

“2.—The supreme government of the church consists in feeding Christ’s sheep and lambs; according unto that, when our Saviour performed that promise unto Peter, of making him his universal shepherd, by such unlimited jurisdiction, ‘Feed my lambs;’ and not only so, but feed those that are the feeders of those lambs; ‘Feed my sheep.’ Now, my lords, can any of us say unto the king, *pasee oves*?

“God hath given unto his church, some to be apostles, some evangelists, some pastors, some doctors; that they might edify the body of Christ: so that you must make the king one of these, before you can set him one over these; and, when you have made him one of these supreme heads of the church, he must be such a head as may be answerable to all the members of Christ’s body: and it is not the few ministers of an island that must constitute a head over the universe; or at least, by such example, we must allow as many heads over the church, as there are sovereign powers within Christ’s dominion; and then what will become of the supremacy; every member must have a head: *attendite vobis*, was not said to kings, but bishops.

“Secondly, let us consider the inconveniences that will arise upon this grant: we cannot grant this unto the king, but we must renounce our unity with the see of Rome; and, if there were no further matter in it than a renouncing of Clement VII., pope thereof, then the matter were not so great: but in this we do forsake the first four general councils, which none ever forsook; we renounce all canonical ecclesiastical laws of the church of Christ; we renounce all other Christian princes; we renounce the unity of the Christian world; and so leap out of Peter’s ship, to be drowned in the waves of all heresies, sects, schisms, and divisions.

“For the first and general council of Nice acknowledged Silvester’s (the bishop of Rome) authority to be over them, by sending their decrees to be ratified by him.

“ The council of Constantinople did acknowledge pope Damasus to be their chief, by admitting him to give sentence against the heretics Macedonius, Sabellinus, and Eunomius.

“ The council of Ephesus acknowledged pope Celestine to be their chief judge, by admitting his condemnation upon the heretic Nestorius.

“ The council of Chalcedon acknowledged pope Leo to be their chief head ; and all general councils of the world ever acknowledged the pope of Rome (only) to be the supreme head of the church. And now shall we acknowledge another head ? or one head to be in England, and another in Rome ?

“ Thirdly, we deny all canonical and ecclesiastical laws ; which wholly do depend upon the authority of the apostolical see of Rome.

“ Fourthly, we renounce the judgment of all other Christian princes, whether they be Protestants or Catholics, Jews or Gentiles ; for, by this argument, Herod must have been head of the church of the Jews, Nero must have been head of the church of Christ, the emperor must be head of the Protestant countries in Germany, and the church of Christ must have had never a head till about three hundred years after Christ.

“ Fifthly, the king's majesty is not susceptible of this donation : Ozias, for meddling with the priest's office, was resisted by Azarias, thrust out of the temple, and told that it belonged not to his office. Now if the priest spake truth in this, then is not the king to meddle in this business : if he spoke amiss, why did God plague the king with leprosy for this, and not the priest ?

“ King David, when the ark of God was in bringing home, did he place himself in the head of the priests' order ? did he so much as touch the ark, or execute any the least, properly belonging to the priestly function ? or did he not rather go before, and abase himself amongst the people, and say that he would become yet more vile, so that God might be glorified.

“ All good Christian emperors have evermore refused



ecclesiastical authority; for, at the first general council of Nice, certain bills were privily brought unto Constantine, to be ordered by his authority; but he caused them to be burnt, saying, *Dominus vos constituit*, &c., God has ordained you (priests), and hath given you power to be judges over us; and therefore, by right, in these things, we are to be judged by you; but you are not to be judged by me.

“Valentine, the good emperor, was required by the bishops to be present with them, to reform the heresy of the Arians; but he answered, ‘Forasmuch as I am one of the members of the lay-people, it is not lawful for me to define such controversies; but let the priests, to whom God hath given charge thereof, assemble where they will in due order.’

“Theodosius, writing to the council of Ephesus, saith, ‘It is not lawful for him that is not of the holy order of bishops, to intermeddle with ecclesiastical matters:’ and now shall we cause our king to be head of the church, when all good kings have abhorred the very least thought thereof, and so many wicked kings have been plagued for so doing! Truly, my lords, I think they are his best friends that dissuade him from it; and he would be the worst enemy to himself, if he should obtain it.

“Lastly, if this thing be, farewell all unity with Christendom! For, as that holy and blessed martyr Saint Cyprian saith, all unity depends upon that holy see, as upon the authority of St. Peter’s successors; for, saith the same holy father, all heresies, sects, and schisms, have no other rise but this, that men will not be obedient to the chief bishop; and now, for us to shake off our communion with that church, either we must grant the church of Rome to be the church of God, or else a malignant church. If you answer, she is of God, and a church where Christ is truly taught, his sacraments rightly administered, &c., how can we forsake, how can we fly from such a church? certainly we ought to be with, and not to separate ourselves from such a one.

“If we answer, that the church of Rome is not of God, but a malignant church; then it will follow, that we, the

inhabitants of this land, have not yet received the true faith of Christ ; seeing we have not received any other gospel, any other doctrine, any other sacraments, than what we have received from her, as most evidently appears by all the ecclesiastical histories : wherefore, if she be a malignant church, we have been deceived all this while ; and if to renounce the common father of Christendom, all the general councils, especially the first four, which none renounce, all the countries of Christendom, whether they be Catholic countries or Protestant, be to forsake the unity of the Christian world ; then is the granting of the supremacy of the church unto a king, a renouncing of this unity. a tearing of the seamless coat of Christ in sunder, a dividing of the mystical body of Christ his spouse limb from limb ; and tail to tail, like Samson's foxes, to set the field of Christ's holy church all on fire ; and this is it which we are about : wherefore let it be said unto you in time, and not too late, look you to that."—(*Bailey's Life of Fisher.*)

This profound and unanswerable speech had considerable effect upon the whole convocation for a time, but, in the end, the king obtained the consent of the assembly, through the artful persuasions of his emissaries, and the worldly-mindedness of some of the leading dignitaries. In the mean time Cranmer, as we have before stated, got appointed to the high dignity of archbishop of Canterbury and primate of all England. The link of unity formed by the divine founder of the church being thus dissevered, the only means left to preserve a uniformity of faith were acts of parliament and pains and penalties ; but those were found ineffectual almost as soon as the king assumed the character of pope. Harry himself, with the exception of the supremacy, was rigidly attached to the dogmas of the Catholic church, but as he had no divine authority to rule the consciences of men, he could not prevent others from exercising their visionary fancies in the way of religion-making as well as himself, and hence, the nation soon swarmed with religious tinkers, each battering the other's kettle, until the people were distracted and almost

maddened with the discordant sounds. It is now time to give the account of the modern editors of Fox of these proceedings, which we perceive they have extracted from Burnet's Abridgment. They say, "The convocation sat at the time, and was much employed. Latimer preached a Latin sermon before them; he was the most celebrated preacher of that time; the simplicity of his matter, and his zeal in expressing it, being preferred to more elaborate compositions. The convocation first confirmed the sentence of divorce between the king and queen Anne. Then the lower house made an address to the upper house, complaining of sixty-seven opinions, which they found were very much spread in the kingdom, These were either the tenets of the old Lollards, or of the new Reformers, or of the Anabaptists; and many of them were only indiscreet expressions, which might have flowed from the heat and folly of some rash zealots, who had endeavoured to disgrace both the received doctrines and rites. They also complained of some bishops who were wanting in their duty to suppress such abuses. This was understood as a reflection on Cranmer, Shaxton, and Latimer, the first of whom it was thought was now declining, in consequence of the fall of queen Anne.

"But all these projects failed, for Cranmer was now fully established in the king's favour; and Cromwell was sent to the convocation with a message from his majesty, that they should reform the rites and ceremonies of the church according to the rules set down in scripture, which ought to be preferred to all glosses or decrees of popes.

"There was one Alesse, a Scotchman, whom Cromwell entertained in his house, who, being appointed to deliver his opinion, shewed that there was no sacrament instituted by Christ but baptism and the Lord's supper. Stokesly answered him in a long discourse upon the principles of the school divinity; upon which, Cranmer took occasion to shew the vanity of that sort of learning, and the uncertainty of tradition; and that religion had been so corrupted in the latter ages, that there was no finding out the truth but by resting on the authority of the scriptures. Fox, bishop of Hereford, seconded

him, and told them that the world was now awake, and would be no longer imposed on by the niceties and dark terms of the schools; for the laity now did not only read the scriptures in the vulgar tongues, but searched the originals themselves; therefore they must not think to govern them as they had been governed in the times of ignorance. Among the bishops, Cranmer, Goodrick, Shaxton, Latimer, Fox, Hilsey, and Barlow, pressed the Reformation; but Lee, archbishop of York, Stoksley, Tonstall, Gardiner, Longland, and several others, opposed it as much. The contest would have been much sharper, had not the king sent some articles to be considered of by them, when the following mixture of truth and error was agreed upon:—

“1. That the bishops and preachers ought to instruct the people according to the scriptures, the three creeds, and the four first general councils.

“2. That baptism was necessary to salvation, and that children ought to be baptized for the pardon of original sin, and obtaining the Holy Ghost.

“3. That penance was necessary to salvation, and that it consisted in confession, contrition, and amendment of life, with the external works of charity, to which a lively faith ought to be joined; and that confession to a priest was necessary where it might be had.

“4. That in the eucharist, under the forms of bread and wine, the very flesh and blood of Christ were received.

“That justification was the remission of sins, and a perfect renovation in Christ; and that not only outward good works, but inward holiness, was absolutely necessary. As for the outward ceremonies, the people were to be taught.—1. That it was meet to have images in churches, but they ought to avoid all such superstition as had been in times past, and not to worship the image, but only God. 2. That they were to honour the saints, but not to expect those things from them which God only gives. 3. That they might pray to them for their intercession, but all superstitious abuses were to cease; and if the king should lessen the number of saints' days, they

ought to obey him. 4. That the use of the ceremonies was good, and that they contained many mystical significations that tended to raise the mind towards God ; such were vestments in divine worship, holy water, holy bread, the carrying of candles, and palms and ashes, and creeping to the cross, and hallowing the font, with other exorcisms. 5. That it was good to pray for departed souls, and to have masses and exequies said for them ; but the scriptures having neither declared in what place they were, nor what torments they suffered, that was uncertain, and to be left to God ; therefore all the abuses of the pope's pardons, or saying masses in such and such places, or before such images, were to be put away. These articles were signed by Cromwell, the two archbishops, sixteen bishops, forty abbots and priors, and fifty of the lower house. The king afterwards added a preface, declaring the pains that he and the clergy had been at for the removing the differences in religion which existed in the nation, and that he approved of these articles, and required all his subjects to accept them, and he would be thereby encouraged to take further pains in the like matters for the future.

“ On the publication of these things, the favourers of the Reformation, though they did not approve of every particular, yet were well pleased to see things brought under examination ; and since some things were at this time changed, they did not doubt but more changes would follow ; they were glad that the scriptures and the ancient creeds were made the standards of the faith, without adding tradition, and that the nature of justification and the gospel-covenant was rightly stated ; that the immediate worship of images and saints was condemned, and that purgatory was left uncertain : but the necessity of auricular confession, and the corporeal presence, the doing reverence to images, and praying to saints, were of hard digestion to them ; yet they rejoiced to see some grosser abuses removed, and a Reformation once set on foot. The popish party, on the other hand, were sorry to see four sacraments passed over in silence, and the trade in masses for the dead put down. At the same time other things were in con-



sultation, though not finished. Cranmer offered a paper to the king, exhorting him to proceed to further reformation, and that nothing should be determined without clear proofs from scripture, the departing from which had been the occasion of all the errors that had been in the church. Many things were now acknowledged to be erroneous, for which some, not long before, had suffered death. He therefore proposed several points to be discussed, as, Whether there were a purgatory? Whether departed saints ought to be invocated, or traditions to be believed? Whether images ought to be considered only as representations of history? And, Whether it was lawful for the clergy to marry? He prayed the king not to give judgment in these points till he heard them well examined; but all this was carried no further at that period."

We must now examine this account, which has a mixture of truth with falsehood, and is calculated to disguise the former for the purpose of leading the people into the latter. Why Latimer should be named as the preacher, without giving the substance of the discourse, remains to be explained, for the simplicity of his matter, and his zeal in expressing it, conveys just nothing, unless we know what the matter consisted of. However, the first act of the convocation was to confirm the sentence of divorce passed by Cranmer between Henry and Anne Boleyn. Here, then, we have a specimen of the mean submission which this once learned and spirited body of men paid to the mandates of a tyrant. Cranmer and his associates were as pliant to the king's amours as ever he could wish, and never was head of the church so well accommodated in his lewd and irreligious work as Henry found himself. The clergy very civilly dissolved the marriage of Anne Boleyn, as they had dissolved the previous marriage of Catharine with Henry, and the parliament, as kindly, declared the issue of Anne, namely Elizabeth, illegitimate, as it had declared Catharine's daughter, Mary, to be the same. But what shall we say of Cranmer's conduct in the case of Anne, to whom, of all persons living, he was

under the greatest obligations? His treatment of his benefactress was so barefacedly ungrateful, that even his greatest panegyrist, Burnet, could not view without concern this odious blot on the life of this most notorious dissembler and cold-blooded villain. Well, this matter being settled to the king's wish, the lower house, we are told, made complaint of the diversity of opinions which were found to spread in the kingdom, and they further complained of the negligence of some of the bishops, who were understood to be Cranmer, and Shaxton, and Latimer. The former was raised to his high situation by Henry, the two latter by the influence of Anne Boleyn. So, then, as we have before observed, the acknowledgment of Henry as supreme head of the *church*, was followed by the introduction of innumerable heresies, and the perpetration of countless injustices and murders. For more than a thousand years the people, by being locked in the bonds of unity with the *whole* universe, by the profession of the *same faith*, devoted themselves to the practice of every virtue, and were careful to preserve their civil rights. Secure from the distraction of silly fanatics, and grounded in the sure rule of Christianity, they devoted their time to the cultivation of the arts and sciences, and while they raised magnificent temples to the worship of the living God, they were not less tenacious of their country's honour, and by the prowess of their deeds in arms, they became as renowned for their attachment to religion, as for their valourous exploits. The laws of England were founded on justice, and the people were then the freest of the free in all Christendom. Every man could then sit and repose under the shade of his own vine, and England was really then, what she is now nominally considered, the envy of surrounding nations, and the admiration of the world. Now she is represented by Burnet, under the new pope, as the prey of faction, and the nursery of heresy and inquietude. Whatever might have been the thoughts of Cranmer's opponents, Tom knew very well how to keep in Harry's good graces. Burnet tells us that these three worthies, to secure

their favour with Henry, protested to him "that they meant to do *nothing* that might *displease the king*, whom they acknowledged to be *their supreme head*; that they were resolved to obey his laws, and they renounced the pope's authority with all his laws." This compliable declaration the modern editors have suppressed, probably, as reflecting no great credit upon the reforming heroes.

We must now look into the other proceedings of this shackled and corrupted assembly. One Alesse, a Scotchman, and a creature of Cromwell, we are told, was appointed to shew that there never were more than two sacraments of Divine institution, though the whole Christian world, from the first foundation of the church, believed there were seven. Who this Scotchman was we have no clue whatever, other than that he was a sojourner in Cromwell's house; but whether he was a learned divine, or an ignorant fanatic, we cannot learn, nor have we *one* argument stated, that he produced, supposing him to have argued the case, on which to form a conclusion. Stoksley, the then bishop of London, it is said, answered this Scotchman in a long discourse upon the principles of the school divinity; upon which Cranmer took occasion to shew "*the vanity of that sort of learning, and the uncertainty of tradition*; and that religion had been so corrupted in the latter ages that there was no finding out the truth but by resting on *the authority of the scriptures*." Well said, Tom! but pray tell us on whom the authority of the scriptures rested. If religion had become so corrupted in the latter ages as to render it difficult to discover the truth, what assurance have you that the scriptures were not corrupted by those who had so corrupted religion? When the reformers began to discover the truth, they began at the same time to *corrupt the scriptures*. This is a notorious fact. The reformers, in preaching the word of God, or rather, in passing off their chimerical notions of divinity as articles of divine faith, corrupted and adulterated the original text of the bible, and imposed it upon their credulous hearers as the word of God. What blasphemy was not practised by

these abandoned hypocrites, in addition to the work of sacrilege, and robbery, and bloodshed, we have already detailed? For our part, we look upon this account to be purely fictitious, the invention of Fox or Burnet's brain; for, is it to be supposed that Cranmer, or any other of the bishops, who were Lutherans in their hearts, would dare openly to deny the divine origin of the seven sacraments, which Henry himself had defended against Luther, and held so steadfast that he would have shortened even his favourite archbishop Tom a head, if he had dared to impugn any one of them? But let us go a little further into this disputation. Fox, bishop of Hereford, we are informed, seconded Cranmer against Stoksley, "and told them that *the world was now AWAKE*, and would no longer be imposed on by the niceties and dark terms of the schools, for the *laity* now did not only read the scriptures in the *vulgar tongues*, but *searched the originals themselves*; therefore they must not think to govern them as they had been governed in the times of ignorance." Ah! Gilbert Burnet, when you told this fine tale, you did not expect the people would really begin to see through the stratagems played off to lull them to sleep. We do not believe that Fox was so lost to his character as to make such a statement as you have imputed to him; but, allowing him to have made it, what does it amount to? Absurdity and falsehood! The world was said to be now wide awake; in which case it must be allowed to have slept a long time, since the Christian part of it had then existed 1500 years with its eyes shut. But the concluding part of the statement is the most extraordinary. The laity are said not only to have read the translation of the scriptures, but even to have *searched the originals*! Is there any one credulous enough to believe this? The laity searching the *originals* of the sacred writings! To be sure they must have been a very learned laity indeed; and we wonder much that, in this case, there was so great and Vandalic a destruction of the libraries of the monasteries and colleges which took place just at that time. And then as to the translations into the vulgar

tongue, we believe at this period there was only *one*, namely Tyndal's, which was found to be filled with so many corruptions, and adulterated with such gross and scandalous opinions, that the king issued a proclamation, ordering all persons to deliver up their copies of this version, declaring that, in respect to the *malignity* of the times, it was better that the scriptures should be expounded by the *learned* than exposed to the misconstruction of the *vulgar*. Now this proceeding looks very much like the world being wide awake, and no longer inclined to be *imposed* upon, since it appears the reformers wished to *impose* upon them with their eyes open. To prevent this was the object of the king's proclamation, and he promised the people, that if it should afterwards appear that *erroneous* opinions were *forsaken*, and Tyndal's version destroyed, he would then provide them a new translation through the labours of learned, tried, and Catholic divines. But what necessity could there be for all this attention on the part of his royal popeship, if *the people* were of themselves able to *search* the originals? The falsehood of the statement imputed to the bishop by Burnet is palpable. The suppression of Tyndal's bible, to be sure, took place before the elevation of Cranmer to the primacy, and as Tom had witnessed the success of so powerful a weapon among the reformers in Germany, he took care, after he was raised to his high station, to recall to the recollection of the royal pope, his promise to give a translation of the scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and his endeavours to procure one were seconded by petitions from the convocation, and the recommendation of Cromwell. The king consented to this importunity, and two printers, named Grafton and Whitchurch, obtained the royal license to publish a folio edition of the bible. "It bore," says Dr. Lingard, "the name of Thomas Mathewe, a fictitious signature; and was made up of the version by Tyndal, and of another by Coverdale, printed very lately, as it was thought, at Zurich. Injunctions were now issued, that a bible of this edition should be placed in every church, at the joint expense of the in-



cumbent and the parishioners; and that any man might have the liberty of reading in it at his pleasure, provided he did not disturb the preacher in his sermon, nor the clergyman during the service. Soon afterwards this indulgence was extended from the church to private houses; but Henry was at all times careful to admonish the readers, that, when they met with difficult passages, they should consult persons more learned than themselves; and to remind them, that the liberty which they enjoyed, was not a right to which they possessed any claim, but a favour granted 'of the royal liberality and goodness.'" The recommendation and permission to print, took place about 1534, the work was completed in 1537, and the indulgence to allow the bible in private houses in 1539. We give these dates, as they will be found useful when we come to detail the persecutions which followed, and which were sanctioned by Cranmer and his base compeers.

It is now time to examine the articles of faith which were sent by the king to be considered by the convocation, and which, we are further told, though compounded of truth and error, were signed by Cromwell and Cranmer, and several of the dignified clergy. With regard to the first, by adopting the three creeds, and the first four general councils, they admitted the doctrines of the Catholic church, for Catholics believe no more now than the fathers of the councils believed then. Of baptism there is no difference in the belief, and with regard to penance we have the Catholic doctrine at once confirmed. We have confession to the priest taught, as necessary to salvation, then we have contrition, and satisfaction by the external works of charity; all which are considered as essentially necessary acts of the sacraments of penance. As to the eucharist, or sacrament of the altar, the *real presence* is most distinctly admitted, and, observe reader, Tom Cranmer, though he rejected this doctrine in his heart, yet he nevertheless subscribed to it, and continued not only to say mass during Henry's lifetime, but consecrated priests to do the same. The eucharist is here said, as it is

in the present church catechism, to be the very flesh and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine : Cranmer solemnly subscribes to this doctrine, which all Catholics hold, and shortly after he burns a poor fellow, and a fanatic old woman, for not believing in this doctrine, as we shall presently see ; yet do Protestants, at this day, swear that such doctrine is damnable and idolatrous, to qualify themselves for office.

We have the system of venerating images retained also, though an injunction is attached, that the people ought to be taught to avoid superstition. And so they were taught, for there is not a Catholic that will not deny that he renders any homage to the image he may pray before, but that his adoration is directed to God, and to God alone. The custom of praying for the dead is also admitted, as well as saying masses for the repose of their souls, which included the doctrine of purgatory ; so that we have here nothing but Catholic doctrine, and the reformers subscribing to such doctrine. It is true, Burnet and the modern editors tell us that when these things were published the reformers did not approve " of every particular," yet they rejoiced to see *some* grosser abuses removed, and a Reformation *set on foot*. This was some consolation to these dissembling and innovating spirits, to be sure ; but if they did not approve of them, why did the heads of the reforming party sign them ? Were these learned reformers ignorant of what was most essential in the Reformation, or were they intimidated by the overbearing temper of Henry ? Principle was made to give way to policy, and though it is attempted to botch up Cranmer's reforming spirit by the introduction of a paper, which it is pretended he presented to the king, exhorting him to proceed further in the work of Reformation, yet it is very well known Henry did not listen to Tom's suggestions, and the latter continued to profess Henry's creed with the most obsequious disposition. The points proposed for discussion had already been decided, and as to Cranmer's praying the king not to give judgment on them till he had

heard them well examined, the act of the six articles, which soon followed, shewed how little influence Tom had over his master, and that Harry was resolved that Tom should obey him.

This assent of the convocation to Henry's book of "articles," which were presented to that assembly by Cromwell, was followed by the publication of a work called, "The godly and pious institution of a Christian Man," subscribed by the archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and certain doctors of canon and civil law, and pronounced by them to accord, "in all things, with the very true meaning of scripture." Dr. Lingard writes:—"It explains in succession the creed, the seven sacraments, which it divides into three of a higher and four of a lower order, the ten commandments, the Pater Noster and Ave Maria, justification and purgatory. It is chiefly remarkable for the earnestness with which it refuses salvation to all persons out of the pale of the Catholic church, denies the supremacy of the pontiff, and inculcates passive obedience to the king. It teaches that no cause whatever can authorize the subject to draw the sword against his prince; that sovereigns are accountable to God alone; and that the only remedy against oppression is to pray that God would change the heart of the despot, and induce him to make a right use of his power." Here then it is placed beyond contradiction that Cranmer, being a Lutheran in his heart, must have been one of the rankest dissemblers that ever bore human shape, seeing that he subscribed to a work which maintained the doctrine of the seven sacraments, purgatory, and exclusive salvation, all which were according to the true meaning of scripture. Another of the blessed fruits of Henry's supremacy, as set forth in this book and subscribed by Cranmer and the clergy, was the doctrine of the *divine right of kings*, which till this period was never heard of in England. Sir Thomas More, who was a sound lawyer, laid it down as a fundamental principle of the British Constitution, that Parliament could make and unmake a king, though it could not alter a law of God. Thus, then, with the inno-

vation of religion, we may trace the invasion of the constitution, and from the destruction of the monasteries we may lay all the evils which have afflicted this now unfortunate, but once happy country, for the last three centuries.

#### PERSECUTIONS FOR RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

The reader is now in possession of the proceedings regarding religion which accompanied the work of spoliation and sacrilege in the destruction of monasteries and seizure of church property. While this work of impiety was going on, the reformers of Germany sent envoys over to Henry to bring the monarch into their views, but the obstinacy of Henry was insurmountable. This embassy was the work of Cranmer, who knowing well that if he dared to thwart his master his head would soon fly from off his shoulders, conceived that foreigners might take a liberty which he dared not do, and flattered himself that through their influence and learning the king might be won over. Several conferences were accordingly held, and Henry, with the aid of the bishop of Durham, was pleased to answer their arguments, which having done, he thanked them for the trouble they had taken, and sent them home. The pope, on the other hand, hearing of the scene of devastation that was going on in England, issued out a bull of excommunication against Henry, and threatened him with spiritual censures. Of this latter affair Burnet thus speaks:—"When these proceedings were known at Rome, the pope immediately fulminated against the king all the thunders of his spiritual store-house; absolved his subjects from their allegiance, and his allies from their treaties with him; and exhorted all Christians to make war against and extirpate him from the face of the earth. But the age of crusades was past, and this display of impotent malice produced only contempt in the minds of the king and his advisers, who steadily proceeded in the great work of reformation; and the translation of the bible into English being now completed, it was printed, and ordered to be read

in all churches, with permission for every person to read it who might be so disposed.

“But, notwithstanding the king’s disagreement with the pope on many subjects, there was one point on which they were alike—they were both intolerant, furious bigots; and while the former was excommunicated as an *heretic*, he was himself equally zealous in rooting out *heresy*, and burning all who presumed to depart from the standard of faith which he had established. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, strengthened this disposition of the king, and persuaded him, under the pretext of a zeal for religion, to persecute the Sacramentarians, or those who denied the corporeal presence in the sacrament.”

This is Burnet’s account, and we have here two remarkable circumstances connected with the work of Reformation, which it will be well for the Protestant reader to notice. First, the steady progress of “the king and HIS ADVISERS in the great work of Reformation,” exemplified in the circulation of the bible in the English language; and secondly, its accompaniment of PERSECUTION, by burning those who dared to differ in opinion from the king and his advisers. Burnet would persuade us there was very little difference between the then pope of Rome and the royal pope of England; both, he says, were intolerant, furious bigots. Well, let it be so; still it must be confessed that the fury of the pope was given to the winds, while the rage of the English pope, unallayed by his advisers, Cranmer, Cromwell, and the like, knew no bounds, and saturated the earth with the blood of his victims. The crafty historian has placed Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, in front of the stage; but we shall see, by and by, even in his own words, that Cranmer was not an unconcerned spectator in these scenes of cruelty and slaughter. We have before shewn that Cranmer was no sooner in the primate’s chair, than he was an actor in the burning of Frith and a poor tailor, for denying the real presence. Of this fact we have the testimony of Cranmer himself, who gives the following account of the affair in a letter which he wrote to Master



Hawkins:—"One Fryth which was in the Tower in pryson, was appoynted by the kyng's grace to be examyned before me, my lorde of London, my lorde of Wynchester, my lorde of Suffolke, my lorde Chancelloure, and my lorde of Wyltshire, whose opynion was so notably erroneouse, that we culd not dispatche hym: but was fayne to leve hym to the determination of his ordinarye, which is the bishop of London. His said opynion ys of such nature, that he thoughte it not necessary to be believed as an article of our faythe, that ther ys the very corporall presence of Christe within the oste and sacramento of the alter: and holdeth of this poynte most after the opynion of Oecolampadius. And surely I myself sent for hym iii or iiij tymes to perswade hym to leve that his imaginacion; but for all that we culd do therein he woulde not apply to any counsaile: notwithstanding he ys nowe at a fynall ende with all examinacions, for my lorde of London hathe gyven sentance, and delyvered hym to the secular power, where he looketh every day to go to a fyer. And ther ys condempned with hym one Andrewe a tayloure of London for the said selfsame opynion."—*Arch.* xvii. p. 81.

Two years after the burning of Frith, that is, in 1535, a colony of Anabaptists came over to England from Germany, and were instantly apprehended; fourteen of them, refusing to recant, were consigned to the flames. In 1538 another batch of them followed, and Cranmer was ordered by the king to call them before him (the archbishop) and three other prelates, to admonish them of their errors, and deliver the contumacious over for punishment. Tom readily complied: four of the number abjured, and a man and woman suffered for their obstinacy, at the stake. The next sufferer was one of more than ordinary interest, and we will here give the account as we find it in the *Book of Martyrs*, before we make any comment upon it.

•• MARTYRDOM OF JOHN LAMBERT.—In consequence of this determination, John Lambert, a teacher of languages in London, who had drawn up ten arguments against the tenets of Dr. Taylor, on the above subject, as delivered in a sermon

at St. Peter's church, and presented them to the doctor, was brought before the *archbishop's* court, to defend his writings; and, having appealed to the king, the royal theologian, who was proud of every occasion of displaying his talents and learning, resolved to hear him in person. He therefore issued a commission, ordering all his nobility and bishops to repair to London, to assist him against heretics. A day was appointed for the disputation, when a great number of persons of all ranks assembled to witness the proceedings, and Lambert was brought from his prison by a guard, and placed directly opposite to the king. Henry, being seated on his throne, and surrounded by the peers, bishops, and judges, regarded the prisoner with a stern countenance, and then commanded Day, bishop of Chichester, to state the occasion of the present assembly. The bishop made a long oration, stating that, although the king had abolished the papal authority in England, it was not to be supposed that he would allow heretics with impunity to disturb and trouble the church of which he was the head. He had therefore determined to punish all schismatics; and being willing to have the *advice* of his *bishops* and *counsellors* on so great an occasion, had assembled to hear the present case.

“ The oration being concluded, the king ordered Lambert to declare his opinion as to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which he did, by denying it to be the body of Christ. The king then commanded CRANMER to refute his assertion, which the latter *attempted*; but was interrupted by Gardiner, who *vehemently interposed*, and, being *unable to bring argument to his aid*, sought, by *abuse* and *virulence*, to overpower his antagonist, who was *not allowed to answer the taunts and insults* of the bishop. Tonstal and Stoksley followed in the same course, and Lambert, beginning to answer them, was silenced by the king. The other bishops then each made a speech in confutation of one of Lambert's arguments, till the whole ten were answered, or rather, railed against; for he was not permitted to defend them, however misrepresented.

“At last, when *the day was passed*, and *torches began to be lighted*, the king, desiring to break up this pretended disputation, said to Lambert, ‘What sayest thou now, after all these great labours which thou hast taken upon thee, and all the reasons of these learned men? Art thou not yet satisfied? Wilt thou live or die? What sayest thou? Thou hast yet free choice.’ Lambert answered, ‘I yield and submit myself wholly unto the will of your majesty.’ ‘Then,’ said the king, ‘commit thyself unto the hands of God, and not unto mine.’ Lambert replied, ‘I commend my soul unto the hands of God, but my body I wholly yield and submit unto your clemency.’ To which the king answered, ‘If you do commit yourself unto my judgment, you must die, for I will not be a patron unto heretics;’ and turning to Cromwell, he said, ‘Read the sentence of condemnation against him;’ which he accordingly did.

“Upon the day appointed for this holy martyr to suffer, he was brought out of the prison, at eight o’clock in the morning, to the house of Cromwell, and carried into his inner chamber, where, it is said, Cromwell desired his forgiveness for what he had done. Lambert being at last admonished that the hour of his death was at hand, and being brought out of the chamber into the hall, saluted the gentlemen present, and sat down to breakfast with them, shewing neither sadness nor fear. When breakfast was ended, he was carried straight to the place of execution at Smithfield.

“The manner of his death was dreadful; for, after his legs were consumed and burned up to the stumps, and but a small fire was left under him, two of the inhuman monsters who stood on each side of him, pierced him with their halberts, and lifted him up as far as the chain would reach; while he, raising his half-consumed *hands*, cried out unto the people in these words: ‘None but Christ, none but Christ;’ and so, being let down again from their halberts, fell into the fire and there ended his life.

“The Popish party greatly triumphed at this event, and endeavoured to improve it. They persuaded the king of the

good effects it would have on his people, who would, in this, see his zeal for the faith; and they forgot not to magnify all that he had said, as if it had been uttered by an oracle, which proved him to be both ‘Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Head of the Church.’ All this wrought so much on the king, that he resolved to call a parliament, for the contradictory purposes of suppressing the still remaining monasteries, and extirpating the ‘new opinions.’ ”

We have given this long account of the death of Lambert, that the reader may be able to judge for himself, of the manner in which the rest of these pretended martyrdoms are detailed. We have no clue to learn from whence the account was obtained, and common sense dictates that the tale is too highly coloured to be *true*. However, there is one thing to be remembered, which is, that though great pains are taken to impress the reader that this execution of Lambert was the exclusive work of the Popish party, the chief actors in the drama were the prime movers of the Reformation, Cromwell and Cranmer, and the *time* of performance *after* the king and his advisers had resolved to proceed steadily in the great work of the Reformation, by translating the Bible into English, and granting permission for every person to read it. This fact must always be borne in mind. It is admitted that Lambert, in the first instance, was brought before “the *archbishop’s* court, to defend his writings,” and this archbishop was no other person than Tom Cranmer, a Lutheran in his heart, and who held the very opinions which Lambert himself held. Before this man’s court was the unfortunate victim brought, and from the judgment of this court, he appealed to the king himself. Of the proceedings before Henry we have a long and minute relation, indeed it is too minute to be correct; there is one circumstance, however, that must not be overlooked. Cranmer is ordered by the king to *refute* Lambert, which the base hypocrite, we are told, *attempted* to do, but, it should seem, *failed* in the attempt, as, it is said, he was interrupted by Gardiner, who took up the cudgels with vehemence and abuse. This attempt,

on the part of Burnet, to screen the abject and slavish compliance of his hero, Cranmer, at the expense of another prelate, who, though culpable in acknowledging the supremacy of Henry, was still attached to the ancient faith, is only to be equalled by the infamy of Cranmer himself. What are we to think of the man who, holding such a high station as the primacy of England in spiritual affairs, would submit to be interrupted by one of his suffragans while in the performance of a duty imposed upon him by the king? Could he have the feelings of an upright mind? Must he not have been a most debased slave, or the most consummate hypocrite that ever breathed? But, as we shall see, and have seen, the whole life of Cranmer, during the reign of Henry, was one continued act of dissimulation, in the practice and profession of religious rites and doctrines which he inwardly renounced and disbelieved. The hired cut-throat, the midnight assassin, the wretch who perjures himself for his daily bread, is a moral character compared with this hoary villain and sanctified murderer, who filled the primate's chair of England, under Henry, the first pope of the reformed church, and his successor Edward, the boy-head of the same church, though altered in faith and discipline. But, to return to Lambert; he was not, Burnet says, allowed to answer the taunts and insults of Gardiner, but was even compelled to listen to further outrages on his own feelings from the other bishops, who had each a separate error to confute, and when Lambert made an effort to reply to them he was stopped by the king. Will any unprejudiced mind give credit to this story? Will it be believed that *ten* bishops were selected to convict *one* unhappy heretic of the same number of erroneous opinions he had imbibed, and this before the new pope to whom poor Lambert had appealed? The thing is incredible. To believe such a preposterous tale would betray a mind warped with the most bigoted prejudice, or devoid of the slightest pretensions to common sense.

The bishops having spent their breath in railing at the poor prisoner, and *torches* being about to be lighted, (had



they no candles at that day?) Henry began to be a little weary, and wishing to break up the disputation, which, by the by, was all on one side, put some questions to Lambert, whose answers not being satisfactory, he ordered Cromwell to *read* the sentence of death against him, which was accordingly done. So then, we have one of Fox's blessed martyrs passing sentence of death upon another of these soldiers of the Reformation. Pretty work this, it must be admitted. Well, the martyr Lambert is brought out of prison on the morning of his execution, and taken to the chamber of afterwards-martyr Cromwell, in order that the latter might ask of the former forgiveness for what he had done! What! is it probable? Is it at all likely that the criminal should be paraded to the chamber of his judge on his way to execution, and that this judge, who was a principal performer in the work of desolation then going forward, and subsequently fell a victim to his crimes, should ask pardon for what he had done? But not only was he permitted to pay this visit to Cromwell, he was also allowed to salute the gentlemen present in the hall, and then to SIT DOWN TO BREAKFAST WITH THEM, shewing neither sadness nor fear! Well said, Gilbert Burnet! We defy Baron Munchausen to beat this specimen of the devil's art. One word more on poor Lambert. Could we believe the description of his death, we should blush for human nature; at least, we meant to say, we should blush for the honour of our country, because we are sorry to say, the cruelties practised by the reformers have equalled the sufferings detailed of Lambert, if nature were capable of sustaining what he is here stated to have undergone. But we do not believe it possible; the description is intended to excite a feeling of horror and abhorrence of the supposed cruelty of Popish executioners, but the tale is evidently overcharged, and palpably untrue. For example; it is said that *after* his legs were *consumed*, they were burned up to *the stumps*; and when the fire was nearly consumed under him, two monsters lifted him up with their halberts as far as the chain would allow them, and letting him fall into

the almost expiring embers, the fire was not put out by the fall, but his life was ended. But if the chain restricted the act of raising, would it not also prevent his falling—and would not the flames that consumed the poor victim's legs to ashes, stifle his breath, and release him from his torments? What prevented him from falling into the flames, while at their utmost height, if the chain permitted him to fall into them when nearly extinguished? Oh! it is a bungling tale, calculated to impose on the unthinking and besotted fanatic; but cannot have any weight with the sensible and reflecting part of the community.

So much for the manner of Lambert's execution; with regard to the insinuation that his death was considered as a *triumph* by the Popish party, this is a trick of Burnet to cover the shame of his heroes, who basely truckled to Harry's inclinations, and flattered him in all his excessive vanities. The paragraph contradicts itself. It is said the Popish party did not forget to magnify what the king had said, and represented his words as an oracle, proving him to be both "Defender of the Faith and Supreme Head of the Church." Now, unluckily for Burnet's veracity, it so happened, that the Popish party not only denied this supremacy by word of mouth, but they exhibited a degree of fortitude which the reforming party did not possess; laying down their lives in support of their doctrines, and evincing by their courage and demeanour the purity of their lives and stability of their faith. Had the Popish party admitted the supremacy of the king in ecclesiastical matters, they would have renounced their faith, and consequently have ceased to have been of *that* party. The fact, however, is as we have stated it, the *reformers* were the flatterers. This is placed beyond a doubt by a letter which Cromwell wrote to Wyatt, the ambassador in Germany. In this epistle, the vicar general says: "The king's majesty presided at the disputation, process, and judgment of a miserable heretic sacramentary, who was burnt the 20th of November. It was wonderful to see how princely, with how excellent gravity and inestimable majesty,

his highness exercised there the very office of supreme head of the church of England: how benignly his grace essayed to convert the miserable man: how strong and manifest reasons his highness alleged against him. I wish the princes and potentates of Christendom to have had a meet place to have seen it." Collier, iii. 152. After this testimony who will credit Fox or Burnet? Dr. Lingard notices the long stories told by Godwin and Fox of this trial, which he considers unworthy of credit. The account states that Henry "regarded the prisoner with a stern countenance;" but this is contradicted by Cromwell's letter, and as Cromwell was afterwards one of Fox's blessed martyrs, surely he will not be charged with falsehood by the enemies of Popery. Lambert is also represented as "shewing neither sadness nor fear," when lead out for death; but, according to Hall, who was present at his trial, he had so little courage and as little ability, that he exhibited signs of great terror on that occasion, and it is not too much to presume that he was not more firm on one of greater moment.

#### THE ACT OF THE SIX ARTICLES.

We come now to another important transaction in this work of (as it is called) Reformation. The *Book of Martyrs* says: "All this," that is, the flattery of the Popish party, (which we have proved belongs to the *reformers*), and the condemnation of Lambert; "all this wrought so much on the king, that he resolved to call a parliament for the *contradictory* purposes of *suppressing* the still remaining monasteries, and *extirpating* the NEW OPINIONS." Oh, oh! NEW OPINIONS! Then the blessed work of Reformation was not grounded on *unchangeable* principles, but upon NEW OPINIONS; and these opinions were so often *renewed* and have been so much *multiplied*, that it is really difficult now-a-days to know what men's *opinions* are with regard to *religion*. The modern editors say the parliament was called for the "contradictory" purposes of suppression and extirpation: on looking into Burnet's *Abridgment*, we find that the words

“contradictory” and “extirpation” have been introduced, by the way, we suppose, of improvement. Burnet writes, that the king “resolved to call a parliament, both for the suppression of the monasteries and the new opinions.” By this mode of expression it would seem that the bishop of Sarum did not consider the two purposes for which the parliament was called “contradictory,” though the modern editors represent them as such. But no matter; it is little to our purpose whether they were contradictory or not, our object is to shew the result and the conduct of the actors in the proceedings. To do this clearly we must borrow a little from Burnet, as we perceive the modern editors have culled from this fabulous historian, and suppressed at their pleasure facts which will throw much light on the subject, but which they did not wish should be elicited.

Burnet says: “Upon Fox’s death, Bonner was promoted to Hereford; and Stoksley dying not long after, he was translated to London. Cromwell thought that he had raised a man that would be a faithful second to Cranmer in his designs of Reformation, who indeed needed help, not only to balance the opposition made to him by other bishops, but to lessen the prejudices he suffered by the weakness and indiscretion of his own party, who were generally rather clogs than helps to him. Great complaints were brought to the court of the rashness of the new preachers, who were flying at many things not yet abolished. Upon this, letters were writ to the bishops, to take care that as the people should be rightly instructed, so they should not be offended with too many novelties. Thus was Cranmer’s interest so low, that he had none to depend on but Cromwell. There was not a queen now in the king’s bosom to support them; and therefore Cromwell set himself to contrive how the king should be engaged in such an alliance with the princes of Germany, as might prevail with him, both in affection and interest, to carry on what he had thus begun.”

From this account we may clearly perceive that the work so improperly termed a Reformation was nothing more nor

less than the struggles of faction and interest, in which the people were the greatest sufferers, and the actors the most abandoned villains. Cromwell it appears was at this time greater in influence at court than Tom Cranmer, who, we are told, needed help in his designs. Again, the preachers of the new opinions are charged with rashness, and were rather clogs than helps in the godly work. There was not a queen in the king's bosom to support the brace of diabolical villains, Cromwell and Cranmer, and therefore it was necessary to look out for one to further their ends. After the death of poor Jane Seymour, who was ripped open, the king could not find a woman of sense and virtue willing to share his bed, so Cromwell looked out for one among the Protestants in Germany, and pitched upon Anne of Cleves. He went to work, and got the lady's consent, and afterwards obtained Harry's, but it proved in the event his own ruin. While Cromwell and Cranmer were concerting these things between them, their interest with the king was declining, and the duke of Norfolk, an old opponent of the archbishop, was rising again in favour. The Catholic sovereigns of Europe, by their negociations with each other, had excited some serious apprehension in the mind of Henry, and he therefore resolved on some project to convince the foreign powers that though he had renounced all subjection to the common father of Christendom, he was still determined to adhere to the ancient doctrine of the church. He therefore summoned a parliament to meet, which accordingly assembled at the call of the monarch. Before we proceed with the transactions of this body, we will give the modern editors' account, which we see is an abridgment of Burnet's *Abridgment*. They say: "The parliament accordingly met on the 28th of April, 1538; and after long debates, passed what was called 'a Bill of Religion,' containing six articles, by which it was declared, that the elements of the sacrament were the real body and blood of Christ; that communion was necessary only in one kind; that priests ought not to marry; that vows of chastity ought to be observed; that private masses were lawful and



useful; and that auricular confession was necessary. This act gave great satisfaction to the Popish party, and induced them to consent more readily to the act for suppressing the monasteries, which immediately followed; by virtue of which their total dissolution soon after took place. The king founded six new bishoprics from a small portion of their immense revenues, and lavished the remainder on his profligate courtiers and favourites."

Here, then, we have another admission that in the foundation of six new bishoprics by the king, but a small portion of the *immense* revenues obtained by the suppression system was appropriated to that purpose, and the greater part was lavished on his profligate courtiers and favourites. Now, these courtiers and favourites were the creatures of the prime villains, Cranmer and Cromwell, as well as the panders of the king, and we gather therefrom the precious materials used to build the *new* church of England. It is hinted that the six articles gave great satisfaction to the Popish party, and induced them to consent more readily to the work of desolation and robbery; now we believe the Popish party had very little hand in the matter, for though many actors in the drama might profess themselves Catholics, the church itself, we believe, did not acknowledge them. We admire the easy manner in which this very interesting subject is glossed over by the modern editors; Burnet himself is more explicit, but he takes special care to screen the conduct of Cranmer in this affair. Let us, then, see how the case stands, and then the reader may decide for himself. We have before noticed that the renunciation of the pope's supremacy, which being of divine right, is the link of unity in the Catholic church, let in a flood of opinions which increased daily, and induced Henry, as head of the church, to devise some method to preserve uniformity. Accordingly, on the meeting of this parliament, which took place on the 28th of April, 1539, a committee of *spiritual* lords was appointed to examine into this diversity of religious opinions. This committee was composed of the archbishops of Canter-

bury and York, the bishops of Durham, Carlisle, Bath, Bangor, Salisbury, and Ely, and Cromwell the lay vicar-general. On every question the members divided five against four. The prelates of York, Durham, Carlisle, Bath, and Bangor, being opposed to Cromwell, Cranmer, and the bishops of Salisbury and Ely. Eleven days were consumed in these divisions, and the head of the new church grew impatient. The duke of Norfolk, who had been commissioned by the king to conduct the affairs of the crown in the house of peers, observing the new pope's impatience, remarked that there was nothing to be expected from the labours of the committee, and proposed that six questions concerning certain points of doctrine should be submitted to the house, which was accordingly done. The questions selected were, the real presence, communion under one kind, private masses, the celibacy of the priesthood, auricular confession, and vows of chastity. The bishops only took a part in the debate on the first day, and on the second day the king-pope came down to the house, and took a share in the discussion. Here was a trial for the two arch deformers; they had hitherto opposed with vehemence their prelatic brethren, but to resist the king, to place themselves in opposition to the new head of the church, in whom was centred the good things of this world, and who could send them at almost an hour's notice to know their fate in the next; to resist such a mighty personage as this was another matter; it required more courage than either of them possessed, and with meanness the most base and truckling, did Cromwell and hight Tom Cranmer, Burnet's famous hero of the Reformation, gulp down in the presence of the king, all they had advanced before their fellow committee-men, and, excepting the bishop of Salisbury, acknowledged themselves vanquished by the superior reasoning and learning of his popeship, as they said, but, as we believe, and as the reader will believe with us, by the terror of displeasing the inexorable tyrant. Though Cranmer and Cromwell could send poor Lambert to the stake, they had no inclination to follow him in defence of their opinions. Fox

and Burnet both assert that Cranmer persisted in his opposition, but these mendacious writers are contradicted by the journals of the house, and by the assertion of one of the lords who were present.—(*See Lingard*, note, vol. iv. p. 287, 4to. edit.)

Henry, having thus far succeeded, was not a little proud of his victory, and sent a message to the lords, congratulating them on their unanimity, and recommending the introduction of a bill to enforce conformity by pains and penalties. To comply with the royal recommendation, two separate committees were appointed to prepare a bill, and it is very singular that three of the prelates who were opposed to the measure at first, but became converts through royal influence, namely, the prelates of Canterbury (Tom Cranmer), Ely, and St. David's, were selected to form one committee, and the bishops of York, Durham, and Winchester, constituted the other. The two bills were submitted to the king by the lords, who chose that drawn up by the latter. The lord Chancellor then introduced it in the usual form to the house, through which it was passed, as also the commons, in a few days, and received the royal assent. As this is one of the most important acts of Henry's reign, we will here transcribe it at length for the satisfaction of the reader.

"The king's royal majesty, most prudently considering, that, by occasion of various opinions and judgments concerning some articles in religion, great discord and variance hath arisen, as well amongst the clergy of this realm, as amongst a great number of the vulgar people; and being in a full hope and trust that a full and perfect resolution of the said articles would make a perfect concord and unity generally amongst all his loving and obedient subjects; of his most excellent goodness not only commanded that the said articles should deliberately and advisedly, by his archbishops, bishops, and other learned men of his clergy, be debated, argued, and reasoned, and their opinions therein to be understood, declared, and known; but also most graciously vouchsafed, in his own princely person, to come unto his high court of

parliament and council, and there, like a wise prince of most high prudence, and no less learning, opened and declared many things, of the most high learning and great knowledge, touching the said articles, matters, and questions, for an unity to be had in the same. Whereupon, after a great and long, deliberate and advised disputation and consultation had, and made concerning the said articles, as well by the consent of the king's highness as by the assent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and other learned men of the clergy, in their convocations, and by the consent of the commons in parliament assembled, it was, and is, finally resolved, accorded, and agreed, in manner and form following ; that is to say,

“ 1. That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of Christ's mighty word, (it being spoken by the priest), is present really, under the forms of bread and wine, the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary ; and that, after the consecration, there remains no substance of the bread or wine, nor any other substance but the substance of Christ, God and man.

“ 2. That the communion in both kinds is not necessary (to salvation) by the law of God, to all persons ; and, that it is to be believed, and not doubted, but that in the flesh, under the form of bread, is the very blood, and with the blood, under the form of wine, is the very flesh, as well apart, as if they were both together.

“ 3. That priests, after the order of priesthood received, may not marry, by the law of God.

“ 4. That vows of chastity, widowhood, &c., are to be kept.

“ 5. That it is meet and necessary that private masses be continued in the king's English church and congregation ; as whereby good Christian people, ordering themselves accordingly, do receive both godly and goodly consolations and benefits, and it is agreeable also to God's law.

“ 6. That auricular confession is expedient, and necessary to be retained, and continued, used, and frequented in the church of God.

“For the which most godly study, pain, and travel of his majesty, and determination and resolution of the premises, his humble and obedient subjects, the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, in this present parliament assembled, not only render and give unto his highness their most high and hearty thanks, and think themselves most bound to pray for the long continuance of his grace's most royal estate and dignity; but being also desirous that his most godly enterprise may be well accomplished and brought to a full end and perfection, and so established that the same might be to the honour of God, and after to the common quiet, unity, and concord, to be had in the whole body of this realm for ever, do most humbly beseech his royal majesty, that the resolution and determination, above written, of the said articles may be established, and perpetually perfected, by the authority of this present parliament.

“It is therefore ordained and enacted by the king our sovereign lord, and by the lords spiritual and temporal, and by the commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that if any person or persons, within this realm of England, or in any other of the king's dominions, do, by word, writing, printing, cyphering, or any otherwise, publish, teach, preach, say, affirm, declare, dispute, argue, or hold any opinion :

“First, That in the blessed sacrament of the altar, under the form of bread and wine . . . . such persons are to suffer pains of death, as in cases of felony, without any benefit of the clergy, or privilege of church, or sanctuary; and shall forfeit all their lands and goods, as in cases of felony.”

The passing of this act not only struck poor archbishop Tom with terror, but all the rest of the tribe were in great alarm. So little were they inclined to become martyrs for their “NEW OPINIONS,” and so desirous were they of keeping a whole skin, that it was deemed by them most prudent to submit to the king's will, and, to insure their safety, remain silent. Latimer and Shaxton, bishops of Worcester



and Salisbury, resigned their sees, and Cranmer found it necessary to be cautious in his conduct for his own safety. It will be borne in mind, that Tom, before his promotion to the archiepiscopal dignity, had taken a niece of Osiander, the reformer, to be his wife, and that he used to transport her from place to place, in a *box*, after his promotion to the primacy. By this woman he had several children, and though the matter was not made public, yet the secret was sufficiently known to induce many priests to follow Tom's example. The making it felony to cohabit with the sex was an awkward dilemma to these lewd wretches, who already began to feel the rope round their necks, and to avoid its being drawn tight, many of them scampered out of the way, and some others put aside their wives. Tom Cranmer had tried, previous to the passing of this tremendous law, to soften Harry's inflexible aversion to a married clergy, but the king was not to be moved; so the archbishop, on the passing of this act, not willing to lose his dignity, packed off his wife and children to Germany, and then following up his consummate baseness, wrote a crawling apology to Henry, for his presumption in daring to differ from the monarch's will on this point.

Burnet tells us, "The poor reformers were now exposed to the rage of their enemies, and had no comfort from any part of it, but one, that they were not delivered up to the *cruelty of the ecclesiastical courts*, or the trials *ex officio*, but were to be tried by juries; yet the benefit of abjuration was a severity without precedent, and was a *forcing* martyrdom on them, since they were not to be the better for their apostacy. It was some satisfaction to the *married* clergy, [he adds], that the incontinent priests were to be so severely punished; which Cromwell put in, and the clergy knew not how they could decently oppose it." Surely this act must have been devised by the archfiend, that it put the godly reformers into such a fright. But why did they not follow the example of the two chiefs, Cromwell and Cranmer, but especially the latter, who had been so long a Lutheran in his

heart. Tom, when he saw no other resource, with his accustomed baseness, yielded to circumstances and subscribed to the doctrine of the six articles, though he disbelieved them. But what did that signify to him; it was the king's will, and therefore it was right he should obey the supreme head of the church, though he condemned inwardly the doctrine which the new lay-pope promulgated. To preserve his life and his place, this hero of the Reformation, so called, could subscribe outwardly to what he inwardly rejected, thus setting the first example of mental reservation, which succeeding reformers fastened upon Catholics, though their church most strongly condemns such conduct. Though Cranmer denied infallibility to the pope, who could do him no harm, yet he was ready to allow Harry infallibility, because he had power over his life, and that Tom did not wish to part with by any premature means.

Connected with this measure was an act of this parliament which few of the people of this country are acquainted with, but which every one of them should know, as it materially affects the principle of civil and religious liberty, and absolutely subverted the constitution. It was this: in the act which invested all the real and moveable property of the religious houses in the hands of the king, a clause was introduced which laid prostrate at the foot of the throne the liberties of the whole nation. It declared that the king's proclamations ought to have the effect of acts of parliament, and adjudged all transgressors of such proclamations to fine and imprisonment, and those who might endeavour to evade the punishment, by quitting the realm, incurred the guilt of high treason. Only think of this, reader. The *ipse dixit* of a tyrant was made equal to the decrees of two deliberate assemblies, and in cases, too, involving the life and property of the people. This scheme to obtain absolute power was the offspring of Cromwell, who was supported in it by that slave of despotism, Tom Cranmer. The act was not carried through the two houses without considerable opposition, so repugnant was its enactments to everything like British

justice and liberty. But the nation was now distracted by two factions, and the crafty Cromwell succeeded in carrying this odious measure, by the Machiavelian policy, *divide and conquer*. It is a fruitful theme with Fox and Burnet, and other corrupt historians, to represent Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, as a merciless and tyrannical character; yet it is clear, even by the testimony of Fox himself, that Gardiner was averse to this unconstitutional measure, and opposed it even to Harry's face. The wretch Cromwell had frequently inculcated this despotic doctrine before Henry, as we gather from a letter written by Gardiner. "The lord Cromwell," says he, "had once put in the king's head to take upon him to have his will and pleasure regarded for a law; and thereupon I was called for at Hampton Court. And as he was very stout, 'Come on,' my lord of Winchester, quoth he, 'answer the king here, but speak plainly and directly, and shrink not, man. Is not that,' quoth he, 'that pleaseth the king, a law? Have ye not that in the civil laws. *quod principi placuit, &c.*?' I stood still, and wondered in my mind to what conclusion this would tend. The king saw me musing, and with gentle earnestness said, 'Answer him whether it be so or no.' I would not answer the lord Cromwell, but delivered my speech to the king, and told him, that 'I had read of kings that had their will always received for law; but that the form of his reign, to make the law his will, was more sure and quiet; and by this form of government yet be established,' quoth I, 'it is agreeable with the nature of your people. If you begin a new manner of policy, how it frame, no man can tell.' The king turned his back, and left the matter."—*Fox*, ii, 65.

This attempt of Cromwell to establish an absolute despotism in this once free country, is only to be equalled by the conduct of Cranmer, the prime reformer, the hero of the Reformation, and the idol of John Fox and Gilbert Burnet, who endeavoured to promulgate the idea of a *divine right* in kings to govern both in church and state, which notion he committed to paper, and Burnet has preserved in his records. The

doctrine is unexampled, slavish, and disgraceful, as the reader will see by the following citation :—He (Cranmer) teaches, “ that all Christian princes have committed unto them IMMEDIATELY OF GOD the whole care of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God’s word, for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of political and civil governance ; and, in both these ministrations, they must have sundry ministers under them to supply that which is appointed to their several offices : as, for example, the lord chancellor, lord treasurer, lord great master, and the sheriffs for civil ministers ; and the bishops, parsons, vicars, and such other priests AS BE APPOINTED BY HIS HIGHNESS in the ministration of the word : as, for example, the bishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Duresme, the bishop of Winchester, the parson of Winwick, &c. All the said officers and ministers, as well of that sort as the other, must be appointed, assigned, and elected, and in every place, by the laws and orders of kings and princes, with diverse solemnities, WHICH BE NOT OF NECESSITY, but only for good order and seemly fashion ; for if such offices and ministrations were committed without such solemnity, they were, nevertheless, truly committed : and there is no more promise of God, that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of the civil office.” It is the fashion with Protestants to boast of the liberty produced by what they call the Reformation ; but did the world ever before witness such doctrine of passive obedience and divine right as the arch-reformer Cranmer here taught ? Did England ever witness a parliament in Catholic times, that by its own act abrogated its own power, contrary to the crown ? Oh ! no : Catholics, imbibing the principles of true liberty from the doctrines and canons of their church, knew not only *how* to establish it, but likewise *how* to preserve it ; while Protestants, despising the unerring rules of Divine Wisdom, and trusting to the vain caprices of the human mind, have thrown away the substance of that celestial blessing, without which life is valueless, to grasp at the shadow.

FURTHER INSTANCES OF THE SLAVISHNESS OF CROMWELL  
AND CRANMER.

The submission of Cromwell and Cranmer to the act of the six articles, though the latter was, according to Burnet, a Lutheran in his heart, was followed by another proceeding still more disgraceful and infamous on the part of the latter. We have seen the fate of Anne Boleyn and her relatives, who were accounted, by this far-famed historian, the prop and pillar of the reforming party. Jane Seymour, who supplied her place, fell by the doctor's knife, being ripped open in child-bed, to gratify the king's wish for a son, who was afterwards the boy-pope, Edward VI. Her fate, combined with that of her predecessor, alarmed the sex, so that Harry could find no one willing to share his bed, and it was while the king remained a widower, that the six articles of religion were enacted and the reformers put into such a fright. Cromwell was not insensible of the ticklish situation in which he stood, now that there were no more prizes to distribute from the spoils of the church, and, under these circumstances, he turned his eyes towards Germany, and sought among the Lutheran courts a mistress for his capricious master. At length he pitched upon Anne of Cleves, whom Cromwell found willing to engage with Harry, and he succeeded in gaining the king's consent to the marriage. Cromwell and Cranmer both thought to forward the Reformation scheme by this match, but, by a singular instance of the Divine hand, it proved to be the downfall of the monastery destroyer. The marriage contract had scarcely been concluded, than Harry conceived an utter aversion to his new wife, and as suddenly became enamoured with Catherine Howard. In consequence of this change in his desires, he took a dislike to Cromwell, considering this minister to be the cause of the hated match, and his being yoked for life, as he then thought, to a partner he detested. Harry resolved therefore to be revenged on Cromwell, who was soon after arrested and, as we have before shewn, consigned to the executioner's hands. Previous, how-



ever, to his death, his partner in the work of Reformation, Tom Cranmer, was called upon to perform a work, which even his panegyrist, Burnet, blushed at. Harry having disgraced his former favourite, Cromwell, was resolved to be separated from his new wife, and accordingly he sent for Cranmer, who was ordered to summon the convocation, and prepare the business agreeably to the king's wishes. As Tom had readily performed such a job for his master before, it was not to be expected that he would be backward in complying with the second request, so he set to work, and though there was not a shadow of a pretext to disannul the marriage, it being legally and lawfully contracted, the king's whim must be gratified, and after only two days' sham ceremony of receiving depositions and examining witnesses, the sentence of divorce between Henry and Anne of Cleves was pronounced on the 9th of July, 1540, by the compliable Tom Cranmer, in his capacity of primate of England. Burnet, as we have before observed, was ashamed of this act, and acknowledges that this was the greatest piece of compliance the king had from Cranmer and the clergy, for they all knew that there was nothing on which they could ground a sentence of divorce. Cranmer presided over the convocation, gave sentence, and afterwards carried the result to parliament, in which body Harry found as ready slaves to his will as he found among the clergy, so great a change was made in the dispositions of the nobility and gentry with the change of religion. An act was passed confirming the decision of the synod, and every person who should presume to believe or judge the marriage lawful was subjected to the penalties of treason. Cromwell, the reader will observe, was at this time in disgrace and under arrest; and this situation of the once overbearing and haughty favourite is made an excuse by Burnet for the archbishop's obsequious conduct. This bishop historian represented his hero, Tom Cranmer, as a second Athanasius for his courage, and a second Cyril for his virtue; yet, in this case, he is obliged to admit that Tom's courage failed him, and how far his virtue came off without a stain we will leave the reader to

conclude. Burnet says, that “overcome with *fear* (for he knew it was contrived to send him quickly after Cromwell) he (Cranmer) consented with the rest.” Yes, yes; this pillar and underprop of the Reformation was too fond of life to lose it in defence of virtue and justice. The modern editors of the *Book of Martyrs*, speaking of this divorce, say, “The convocation unanimously dissolved the marriage, and gave him (Henry) liberty to marry again; indeed it is probable, that if he had desired to have two or more wives at once, the measure would have been sanctioned, so *base* and *servile* were the *courtiers* and *priests* by whom this monstrous tyrant was surrounded.” Say you so, most worthy instigators of hatred and abhorrence to the professors of Popery! But *who* were these *base* and *servile courtiers* and *priests*? Was not CRANMER at the *head* of the latter? Base and servile was Tom to the monstrous tyrant, who is *said* to have rescued this country from the tyranny of the pope. Anne, you know, most learned instigators of uncharitableness, was brought over from Germany by the *reforming party*, to be their prop in the bosom of the king; and yet this very party, base and servile to the king’s wishes, no sooner found the king disliked her, than she was abandoned by them, without any ceremony. The clergy were base and servile, to be sure, but they were not Catholics, strictly speaking, for they had forsaken and forsworn the head of the Catholic church, though some of them still adhered to her doctrines. But there were reforming clergy in the convocation, and as that body was unanimous in its consent, the “godly crew” were as base and servile as those represented to form the Popish party. This fact cannot be got over, and we agree with the editors, that Cranmer and his reforming brethren would have made as little scruple in granting Harry as many wives as the Koran allows to Mussulmen, had he required it, for we have a proof of the readiness of the reformers to gratify the beastly appetites of monarchs, in the license granted by Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, and other reforming divines, to the Landgrave of Hesse to have two wives at once.

So much for Cranmer and Anne of Cleves, who was expected to be as useful in the work of Reformation as her namesake, but was abandoned without reserve when it was discovered she could not advance the cause. Her fate, however, was different from that of her predecessor, as she had the sense to submit without a murmur to the king's will, and retired to Richmond with a pension. The next wife selected by Henry was a *Protestant* lady too, namely, Catharine Howard, neice to the duke of Norfolk. She gained an ascendancy in the king's affections, which she maintained about a year, but as she was related to his grace of Norfolk, who had always been a stout opposer of Cranmer and Cromwell, and their party, a plot was formed which proved her downfall, and brought her to an untimely end. The modern editors say, on the testimony of Burnet, that the king was so delighted with the charms of Catharine Howard, his fifth wife, that he "even gave public thanks to God for the excellent choice he had made." The royal pope, however, was somewhat hasty in his conclusions, for the same historian states, that the very day after his public prayers, Cranmer appeared before his lay holiness, with an account of the infidelity of his most excellent wife. Harry was thunder-struck; he could not believe the tale, but Cranmer wrought on the unfortunate lady to make confession of her guilt, on which she admitted having been guilty of lewdness before her marriage, but denied that she had defiled the nuptial bed. The modern editors say, "she was convicted *on the clearest evidence*," which does not appear to have been the case, at least so far as regarded her marriage. However, guilty or not, she was condemned and executed on the 14th of February, 1541, along with the lady Rochford, who was instrumental in bringing Anne Boleyn to the block. Burnet and the modern editors make a mystery of this circumstance, and consider it a Divine judgment on her baseness and falsehood to that *injured* queen; we have no affection for this lady, as we consider them all tarred with the same stick, but we must deny that Anne Boleyn was "an *injured* queen,"

any more than Catharine Howard. Mrs. Anne was the concubine of Henry during the lifetime of his lawful wife, Catharine of Arragon, and was married to him after his mock divorce from that noble-minded princess. Kate Howard was a lewd hussy previous to her marriage with the king, which marriage, observe, was during the life of his lawful wife, Anne of Cleves.

Beside the lady Rochford, Dereham and Calpepper were put to death under suspicion of improper intimacy with Catharine, and the lord Howard, her father, his wife, four men, and five women, were condemned in the penalties of misprision of treason, because they had not revealed the previous incontinency of the queen. On the execution of this fifth wife of Henry, the first pope of England, Dr. Lingard has the following remarks:—"To attain without trial was now become customary; but to prosecute and punish for that which had not been made a criminal offence by any law, was hitherto unprecedented. To give, therefore, some countenance to these severities, it was enacted in the very bill of attainder, that every woman about to be married to the king or any of his successors, not being a maid, should disclose her disgrace to him under the penalty of treason; that all other persons knowing the fact and not disclosing it, should be subject to the lesser penalty of misprision of treason; and that the queen, or wife of the prince who should move another person to commit adultery with her, should suffer as a traitor." Truly this is pretty work, and well worthy the event which gave rise to these scandalous and unholy doings, inimical alike to freedom of conscience, purity of morals, and personal liberty of the subject.

#### MORE MATTERS CONCERNING RELIGION.

Harry, having thus rid himself of his fifth wife, began to turn his attention to the duties imposed upon him as head of the church. The translation of the bible into the vulgar tongue, had generated a race of teachers who propounded the most discordant and absurd doctrines. The scriptures

were taken to alehouses and taverns; discussions, heated by the potent fumes of strong liquors, were carried on, and generally ended in breaches of the peace. With a view to remedy these evils, a restraint was placed on reading the scriptures, Tindall's bible was condemned as "crafty, false, and untrue," but that the people might not be without spiritual food, his royal highness issued a code of doctrines and ceremonies, published under the title of "*A Necessary Doctrine and Education for any Christened Man*;" it was also distinguished as "*The King's Book*," and being approved by both houses of the convocation, was considered the only authorized standard of English orthodoxy. On these labours of mending and devising new articles of faith, Father Parsons has a very pleasant story in his *Three Conversions of England*, written in answer to Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, which has afforded us some amusement, and as it is equally applicable to the present times as to those in which the learned author wrote, we will here insert it.

"A certain courtier at that day, (some say it was Sir Francis Byran), talking with a lady that was somewhat forward in the new gospel, about this book of the king's then lately come forth, she seemed to mislike greatly the title thereof, to wit, *Articles devised by the King's Highness, &c.*, saying, that 'it seemed not a fit title to authorize matters in religion, to ascribe them to a mortal king's device.' Whereunto the courtier answered, 'Truly, madam, I will tell you my conceit plainly: if we must needs have devices in religion, I would rather have them from a king than from a knave, as your devices are; I mean that knave friar Martin, who, not yet twenty years ago, was deviser of your new religion, and behaved himself so lewdly in answering his majesty with scorn and contempt, as I must needs call him a knave; though otherwise I do not hate altogether the profession of friars, as your ladyship knoweth. Moreover (said he) it is not unknown neither to your ladyship nor us, that he devised these new tricks of religion, which you now so much esteem and reverence, not for God, or devotion, or to do penance,



but for ambition, and to revenge himself upon the Dominican friars, that had gotten for him the preaching the pope's bulls; as also to get himself the use of a wench, and that a nun also, which now he holdeth. And soon after him again three other married priests, his scholars, to wit, Ecolampadius, Carlostadius, and Zuinglius, devised another religion of the Sacramentarians, against their said master. And since these again, we hear every day of fresh upstarts that would rather devise us new doctrines, and there is no end of devising and devisers. And I would rather stick to the devising of a king, that have majesty in him, and a council to assist him, (especially such a king as ours is), than to a thousand of these companions put together.'

“‘It is true (said the lady) when they are devices indeed of men; but when they bring scriptures with them to prove their sayings, then they are not men's devices, but God's eternal truth and word.’ ‘And will you say so, madam?’ quoth he. ‘And do you not remember what ado we had the last year about this time, with certain Hollanders here in England, whom our bishops and doctors could not overcome by scriptures, notwithstanding they held most horrible heresies, which make my hair to stand upright to think of them, against the manhood and flesh of Christ our Saviour, and against the virginity of his blessed Mother, and against the baptism of infants, and the like wicked blasphemies. I was myself present at the condemnation of fourteen of them in Paul's church on one day, and heard them dispute and allege scriptures so fast for their heresies, as I was amazed thereat; and after I saw some of these knaves burnt in Smithfield, and they went so merrily to their death, singing and chanting scriptures, as I began to think with myself whether their device was not of some value or no; until afterwards, thinking better of the matter, I blessed myself from them, and so let them go.’

“‘Oh (said the lady) but these were knaves indeed, that devised new doctrines of their own heads; and were very heretics, not worthy to be believed.’ ‘But how shall I know

(quoth the courtier) that your devices have not done the like, seeing these alleged scriptures no less than they; and did one thing more, which is, that they went to the fire and burned for their doctrine, when they might have lived, which your friar and his scholars before named have not hitherto done. And finally, madam, I say, as at the beginning I said, if we must needs follow devising, we courtiers had much rather follow a king than a friar in such a matter. For how many years, madam, have friars shorn their heads, and no courtier hath ever followed them hitherto therein? But now his majesty having begun this last May (as you know) to poll his head, and commanded others to do the like, you cannot find any unshorn head in the court among us men, though you women be exempted. And so I conclude that the device of a king is of more credit than the device of a friar.' And with this the lady laughed; and so the conference was ended."

#### MARTYRDOMS OR PERSECUTIONS.

We have now forty-four pages of the modern book devoted to a relation of the martyrdoms and burnings of some of Fox's "godly" heroes, who, though holding notions the most wild, discordant, and ridiculous that can be imagined, are all classed as soldiers of Christ, though some of them denied his Godhead, and others his existence. To enter into a minute detail of this mass of rodomontade and nonsense would sicken the reader; we shall therefore confine ourselves to some few particular cases. First on the list is an account of the "MARTYRDOM OF DR. ROBERT BARNES," which is followed by the "STORY OF THOMAS GARRETT," and of "WILLIAM JEROME." These effusions of a fanatic brain are ushered in with the following remarks:—"The clergy now, elated by the victory which they had gained by the death of Cromwell, persuaded the king to new severities against the reformers; and three eminent preachers, Drs. Barnes, Gerard, and Jerome, were picked out for sacrifices on this occasion." Here we have the clergy again charged with these acts of

cruelty, and Tom Cranmer, observe, at the head of this clergy. But to the stories. The first hero, we are informed, was educated at Louvain, in Brabant, and on coming to England he went to Cambridge, which he found steeped in the darkest ignorance, but, with the assistance of one Parnel, his scholar, he not only promoted knowledge and truth, but he instructed the students in the classical languages, and soon caused learning to flourish in that university. Barnes was certainly a clever man, but not such a prodigy as he is here represented. The long account given of the proceedings between him and Wolsey is mere fiction; but if true, he must have been as base a villain as Tom Cranmer, for let it not be forgotten that he was the man who was consulted by Taylor, in the case of Lambert, and disclosed the matter to Cranmer, and, in consequence, Cranmer had the poor Lambert summoned before his archiepiscopal court to answer for his presumption. Barnes was also a dependent of Cromwell, and by his imprudence hastened that minister's fall. Gardiner of Winchester, as we have before said, was a stickler for the old doctrine, though through weakness he admitted the supremacy of the king. In a sermon preached by him at St. Paul's cross, he censured the extravagance of those preachers who inculcated doctrines opposite to the established creed. A fortnight after, Barnes, who had imbibed Lutheran principles, boldly defended, in the same pulpit, the doctrines Gardiner had reprobated, and cast many scurrilous invectives against the bishop. Harry got a hearing of his conduct, and summoned the doctor before himself and a commission of divines, where the several points of controverted doctrine were discussed, and Barnes was prevailed upon to sign a recantation. He read his recantation before the audience, asked pardon of Gardiner, and immediately proceeded, in a sermon, to maintain the very doctrine he had but a few minutes before renounced. Such base and insulting conduct irritated the king, who committed him to the Tower, with Garrett and Jerome, two fanatics of the same stamp, who had placed themselves in similar circumstances.

These men were tried for *heresy* and condemned, and we have a long account of their execution ; but the editors forgot to relate, or have wilfully suppressed the fact, that with these three men were other three executed for denying the supremacy of the king, namely, Abel, Powel, and Featherstone. These six victims were coupled together, Catholic and Protestant, on the same hurdle, from the Tower to Smithfield, where the Catholics were hung and quartered as traitors, and the Protestants burned as heretics. Thus it appears the Catholics cannot with justice be blamed for the persecutions in this reign, especially after Henry was acknowledged head of the church, as they suffered in greater proportion than the Protestants. Fox reckons ten Protestants who suffered during the remainder of Henry's reign, and Dodd counts fourteen Catholics in the same period. It must be borne in mind too, that Cranmer, the hero of the thing called the Reformation, sat in the primate's chair during this work of blood and slaughter. In the account given by Fox of the Protestant martyrs, Barnes, Jerome, and Garrett, they are, of course, represented as the most perfect *lights* of the *new* gospel, and the most successful exposers of the supposed errors of the church of Rome. But there is a circumstance related of Barnes, so extravagantly presumptuous, that we must place it upon record. He is represented as making his profession of faith at the place of execution ; after which, " a person present asked him his opinion upon praying to saints. ' I believe,' said he, ' they are in heaven with God, and that they are worthy of all the honour that scripture willeth them to have. But I say, throughout scripture we are not commanded to pray to any saints. Therefore I neither can nor will preach to you that saints ought to be prayed unto ; for then should I preach unto you a doctrine of my own head. Notwithstanding, whether they pray for us or no, that I refer to God. And *if* saints do pray for us, then *I* trust to pray for you within this half-hour, Mr. Sheriff, and for every Christian living in the faith of Christ, and dying in the same as a *saint*. Wherefore, if the dead pray for the quick, I will surely pray

for you.' " We have no stated authority for this precious narrative ; but, taking it for granted that such were the words of Dr. Barnes, it is clear that his opinions were new and contrary to the received doctrine of the Christian world. All England believed in the doctrine of praying to the saints, and that saints prayed for us, without any *if*, and it was the doctrine of the Catholic church from the time of the apostles. No nation whatever received the faith of Christ without receiving this dogma at the same time ; and even here the martyr speaks as of an uncertainty, being made to introduce a convenient *IF*, by the way of evading a direct answer to the question. What reliance then is to be placed on Barnes's creed, when he himself is *doubtful* of its accuracy ? The martyrs of the primitive ages never doubted a single article of their faith, of which this of praying to the saints was one. The fathers who wrote in defence of the Catholic church spoke positively of this doctrine as one of divine revelation, and they quote scripture in proof of it. But though the doctor-martyr was uncertain as to the veracity of his notions, he seems to have no doubt as to his fate in the other world ; this was as sure to him as if he had been before his judge and received the promised reward. But enough has been said of these sufferers, for such they were though they were enthusiasts.

We have now an account of the persecution of one Testwood, but so ridiculous a tale that we shall not notice it. Then follows the persecution of Anthony Pearson, and others equally as absurd, which the reader will admit when he has gone through the following relation given of the proceedings of one of Pearson's companions :—" Marbeck was five times examined before the council ; the bishop of Winchester ; one of the bishop's gentlemen ; the bishops of Salisbury, Hereford, and Ely ; Dr. Knight ; and the bishop of Winchester's secretary. Throughout these examinations he defended the cause of truth with a spirit and boldness which confounded his accusers, but could not turn them from their cruel and bigoted purposes.



“Marbeck had begun a concordance of the bible in English, which was taken, with his other papers, and laid before the council. The bishop of Winchester asked him if he understood Latin, and would scarcely believe that he did not; telling the other lords of the council that it was probable his concordance was a translation from the Latin, and asserting that, ‘if such a book should go forth in English, it would destroy the Latin tongue.’ Marbeck was much pressed to disclose ‘the secrets of his party,’ and promised great rewards and preferment, if he would betray what he had heard of the opinions of Testwood, Pearson, and Haynes, on the mass, &c. He steadily refused all these offers, declaring that he knew nothing against them.

“On his fourth examination, he was told by the bishop of Salisbury that he must answer, on oath, faithfully and truly, to such questions as the commissioners should judge it necessary to put to him; which he promised to do, and was accordingly sworn. Then the bishop laid before him his three books of notes, demanding whose hand they were. He answered they were his own hand and notes, which he had gathered out of other men’s works six years ago. ‘For what cause,’ said the bishop, ‘didst thou gather them?’ ‘For no other cause, my lord, but to come to knowledge. For I, being unlearned, and desirous to understand some parts of scripture, thought by reading of learned men’s works to come the sooner thereby: and where I found any place of scripture opened and expounded by them, that I noted, as ye see, with a letter of his name in the margin, that had set out the work.’ ‘So, methinks,’ said the bishop of Ely, who had one of the books of notes in his hand all the time of their sitting, ‘thou hast read of all sorts of books, both good and bad, as seemeth by the notes.’ ‘So I have, my lord,’ said Marbeck. ‘And to what purpose?’ said the bishop of Salisbury. ‘By my troth,’ replied Marbeck, ‘for no other purpose but to see every man’s mind.’ Then the bishop of Salisbury drew out a *quire* of the concordance, and laid it before the bishop of Hereford, who, looking upon it awhile, lifted up his eyes to

Dr. Oking, standing next to him, and said, 'This man hath been better occupied than a great many of our priests.'

"Then said the bishop of Salisbury, 'Whose help hadst thou in setting forth this book?' 'Truly, my lord,' replied Marbeck, 'no help at all.' 'How couldst thou,' said the bishop, 'invent such a book, or know what a concordance meant, without an instructor?' 'I will tell you, my lord,' said the prisoner, 'what instructor I had to begin it. When Thomas Matthew's bible came out in print, I was much desirous to have one of them; and being a poor man, not able to buy one of them, determined with myself to borrow one amongst my friends, and to write it forth. And when I had written out the five books of Moses in fair great paper, and was entered into the book of Joshua, my friend Mr. Turner chanced to steal upon me unawares, and seeing me writing out the bible, asked me what I meant thereby. And when I had told him the cause, 'Tush,' quoth he, 'thou goest about a vain and tedious labour. But this were a profitable work for thee, to set out a concordance in English.' 'A concordance,' said I, 'what is that?' Then he told me it was a book to find out any word in the bible by the letter, and that there was such an one in Latin already. Then I told him I had no learning to go about such a thing. 'Enough,' quoth he, "for that matter, for it requireth not so much learning as diligence. And seeing thou art so industrious a man, and one that cannot be unoccupied, it were a good exercise for thee.' And this, my lord, is all the instruction that ever I had, before or after, of any man.'

"'And who is that Turner?' asked the bishop of Salisbury. 'Marry,' said Dr. May, 'an honest and learned man, and a bachelor of divinity, and some time a fellow in Magdalen College, in Oxford.' 'How couldst thou,' said the bishop of Salisbury, 'with this instruction, bring it to this order and form, as it is?' 'I borrowed a Latin concordance,' replied he, 'and began to practise, and at last, with great labour and diligence, brought it into this order, as your lordship doth see.' 'It is a great pity,' said the bishop of Ely, 'he had

not the Latin tongue.' 'Yet I cannot believe,' said the bishop of Salisbury, 'that he hath done any more in this work than written it out after some other that is learned.'

"'My lords,' said Marbeck, 'I shall beseech you all to pardon me what I shall say, and grant my request, if it shall seem good unto you.' 'Say what thou wilt,' said the bishop. 'I do marvel greatly whereof I should be so much examined for this book, and whether I have committed any offence in doing it, or no. If I have, then were I loth for any other to be molested or punished for my fault. Therefore, to clear all men in this matter, this is my request, that ye will try me in the rest of the book that is undone. Ye see that I am yet but at the letter L, beginning now at M, and take out what word ye will of that letter, and so in every letter following, and give me the word in a piece of paper, and set me in a place alone where it shall please you, with ink and paper, the English bible, and the Latin concordance; and if I bring you not these words written in the same order and form, that the rest before is, then was it not I that did it, but some other.'

"'By my truth, Marbeck,' cried the bishop of Ely, 'that is honestly spoken, and then shalt thou bring many out of suspicion.' This being agreed to by the commissioners, they bade Dr. Oking draw out such words as he thought best on a piece of paper, which he did; and while the bishops were perusing them, Dr. Oking said to Marbeck, 'Make haste, for the sooner you have done, the sooner you shall be delivered.' And as the bishops were going away, the bishop of Hereford (who, as well as the bishop of Ely, had formerly known the prisoner, and was in secret his friend) took Marbeck a little aside, and informed him of a word which Dr. Oking had written false, and also, to comfort him, said, 'Fear not, there can no law condemn you for anything that ye have done, for if you have written a thousand heresies, so long as they be not your sayings nor your opinions, the law cannot hurt you.' And so they all went with the bishop of Salisbury to dinner, taking Marbeck with them, who dined in the hall at the

steward's board, and had wine and meat sent down from the bishop's table.

"When dinner was done, the bishop of Salisbury came down into the hall, commanding ink and paper to be given to Marbeck, and the two books to one of his men to go with him; at whose going he demanded of the bishop, what time his lordship would appoint him to do it in. 'Against to-morrow this time,' replied the bishop, and so departed. Marbeck, now being in his prison chamber, fell to his business, and so applied himself, that by the next day, when the bishop sent for him again, he had written so much, in the same order and form he had done the rest before, as filled three sheets of paper and more, which, when he had delivered to the bishop, Dr. Oking standing by, he said, 'Well, Marbeck, thou hast put me out of all doubt. I assure thee,' said he, putting up the paper into his bosom, 'the king shall see this, ere I be twenty-four hours older.' But he dissembled in every word, and did not shew it to the king; but afterwards, the king being informed of the concordance which Marbeck had written, said, that he was better occupied than those who persecuted him."

We have copied this long account that our readers may be able to judge for themselves what stupid and gross nonsense, what palpable falsehoods, and what improbable incidents, are coupled together to amuse and deceive the wise children of the Reformation, the learned disciples of bible-interpretation. Can any individual in his proper senses be capable of believing this account of Marbeck's adventures? What! a man who is unlearned, by his own confession, set about writing a concordance of the scriptures, and observe too, this concordance was to supply the place of the bible. Marbeck could not read Latin, but he meets with a copy of Matthew's bible in English, which pleases him so much that he wishes for a copy, but being a *poor* man he could not afford to *buy* one; but mark, reader, though he could not find money to buy a *printed* bible, he could buy *paper* to copy it out, and spare time for copying too, though it must have taken an

immensity of time. Well, with much labour this poor unlearned man gets through the five books of Moses, and is beginning Joshua, when a friend pops in upon him, and seeing what he is about, tells him he was *vainly* occupied, and that a concordance in *English* would be a more PROFITABLE work. Of the nature of this work Marbeck is completely ignorant, but being told what it was, and that there was one in Latin already, he makes another objection, namely, that he had no learning, and did not understand Latin. This obstacle, however, is soon removed by telling him that *learning* was not so much required as *diligence*. Let us here observe, that we wonder much there has never appeared a concordance to the scriptures from the hands of *an ignorant but diligent Protestant* since the time of Marbeck, and we regret much that the MS. of our illiterate author has not been preserved, as it would form a curious relic in one of our learned universities. The concordances now in use have the name of some learned *divine* prefixed to the work by way of recommendation, as it has been generally supposed that learning and ability were essential requisites in the performance of such a literary task ; but it would appear from this tale that we have all along been in error, and that it requires no more learning to compile a concordance than it does to write a rhapsodical philippic against the supposed errors of Popery.

But to return to the diligent and unlearned Marbeck. The only instruction he ever got, we are told, was from his friend Turner, who said that it required not so much learning as diligence, and that as he, Marbeck, was so industrious a soul that he could not remain idle, it were a good exercise for him. Now reader, what instruction do you call this ? What information could Marbeck gain from Turner's words ? Marbeck is ignorant of the construction of a concordance. He is ignorant of the Latin language—he had never heard of such a work—he was engaged in copying a bible ; but all at once he quits his original intention, and engages in a work which he knows nothing about, and which would be of no use to him whatever, as it appears he could not get a bible, and



without a bible a concordance is perfectly useless. Well might the bishop of Salisbury express his surprise that Marbeck was able to bring his manuscript into such form and order with such instruction as he said he had received. Well might the prelate be marvellous at hearing a man profess to be ignorant of the Latin language, and yet declaring that he obtained his knowledge from a book of that language? The whole relation is a mass of inconsistency and falsehood, but the more inconsistent and wonderful a tale, the better and readier it is gulped down by Protestant credulity. From whence this circumstantial account was borrowed, we are not informed. Burnet mentions Marbeck as a singing man, and gives some account of his great ingenuity in this work of the concordance, but he gives us no authority for his statement, any more than the modern editors; and surely, if it were not a work of fiction, such a circumstance might have been authenticated. Burnet admits that the work appeared to be the production of some learned man, and that it seemed incredible that Marbeck, who was known to be an illiterate man, was the author of it. Of the rest of the tale we need say no more, but it would appear that the persecutors of this learned illiterate singer were a little civil and hospitable to him, as they gave him plenty of wine and meat, and in the end he was let off scot free.

Pearson, Testwood, and Filmer, were not so fortunate, being condemned and led out to execution. From the account given by Fox of their last moments, we may suppose they were jolly old toppers, as well as martyrs; for "being all three bound to the post," says Fox, "a young man of Filmer's acquaintance brought him a pot of drink, asking, 'If he would drink?' 'Yea,' cried Filmer, 'I thank you; and now, my brother,' continued he, 'I desire you, in the name of the living Lord, to stand fast in the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ, which you have received;' and so, taking the pot into his hand, he asked Pearson if he would drink, 'Yea, brother Filmer,' replied he, 'I pledge you in the Lord.' Then all three drank; and Filmer, rejoicing in the Lord,

said, 'Be merry, my brethren, and lift up your hands unto God, for after this sharp breakfast I trust we shall have a good dinner in the kingdom of Christ, our Lord and Redeemer.' At which words Testwood, lifting up his hands and eyes to heaven, desired the Lord above to receive his spirit, and Anthony Pearson joined in the same prayer." These guzzling devotions and tippling pledges must have been truly edifying to the spectators; and no doubt have excited many a heavy and pious sigh from the readers of Fox, at the godly heroism of these Reformation martyrs, who practised good drinking to their last moments. One of these guzzling saints, we are told, on arriving at the place of execution, "embraced the post in his arms, and *kissing it*, said, 'Now welcome my own *sweet wife*; for this day shalt thou and I be *married* together in the love and peace of God.'" What are we to understand from this nonsense of the post and Pearson, for that was the sufferer's name, to be *married*, when they were both to be consumed? And then the *kissing* bout,—was not this rank idolatry? The Catholic is charged with idolatry for kissing and venerating the Cross, —the emblem of man's redemption, and surely the kissing a post must amount to the same offence; or is a Protestant martyr to have a greater *indulgence* for kissing than a Catholic sinner?

In concluding this account of the execution of these three tippling heroes, the editors say, "*Thus* they yielded up their souls to the Father of heaven, in the faith of his dear Son, Jesus Christ, with such *humility* and *steadfastness*, that many who saw their patient suffering were *convinced* that nothing but *real religion* could bestow so much constancy and Christian courage." If this were the case, we wonder much that the conversions were not greater than they are said to have been; and it is still greater matter of astonishment that it was soon found necessary to frame cruel and bloody penal laws to prevent the people from relapsing into Popery. Notwithstanding the great exertions used to blind the people, and the horrid conspiracies entered into to alarm the timid

with the supposed bloodthirstiness of the Papists, the Catholic religion has stood its ground in this country, and is now gaining in estimation among the people, while Protestantism has been shivered into a thousand different sects, and its advocates are sinking fast into the gulf of infidelity.

We are now treated with another martyrdom and history, namely, of one Adam Damplin, who had once been a zealous Papist, but proceeding to Rome, he there found "such blasphemy of God, contempt of Christ's true religion, looseness of life, and abundance of all abominations and filthiness," that he soon discovered "the errors of Popery," and gained "a perfect knowledge of the true religion;" at least, so the story goes in Fox's Martyrology. Thus gifted with new light, "this godly man, every morning at seven o'clock [how very minute is Fox in his relations] preached very *learnedly* and *plainly* the *truth* of the blessed sacrament of Christ's body and blood, inveighing against all Papistry, and confuting the same, (but especially those two most pernicious errors—transubstantiation, and the propitiatory sacrifice of the Romish mass), by the *scriptures*, and from the ancient doctors;" but what this *truth* was we are not informed. Now we have clearly proved, in our first volume of this work, that the ancient fathers and doctors were decidedly in favour of these "two most pernicious errors," and that they produced *scripture*, as well as tradition, in *support* of the doctrines of transubstantiation and the mass. It cannot be denied that these "two pernicious errors," as they are called, were coeval with Christianity, and were received with the Christian faith by the people of this country, and by them held at the very moment this Adam Damplin was inveighing against them, and that Tom Cranmer, the Protestant archbishop, had set his name to this belief; and are we to suppose that Adam was wiser than all the rest of the generation? To entertain such a notion would exhibit very little common sense; and, in truth, the people were actually frightened out of their senses, before they gave credit to such preposterous tales as Fox, and Burnet, and the lying crew of interested

writers had told them. But though Master Adam rejected the real presence and the mass, we find he practised *confession*, for the story makes him meet the celebrated concordance-maker, Marbeck, at this religious ceremony; so that here we have this Protestant martyr practising at least one Popish error. In another part of this precious tale, we find Adam was a bouser, as well as the three just mentioned, for he eat and drank as heartily, the narrative says, when he was informed of his sentence, as before. But the conclusion we think more extraordinary than any other part. Without any reason assigned, the prisoner is taken from London, after sentence, to *Calais*, and there, we are told, he was executed for *treason*, in receiving a trifling sum of money of cardinal Pole, a pardon having been granted him for his heretical opinions. Is this probable? Is it at all likely? We do not see him mentioned by Burnet, nor have we, as usual, any clue to ascertain the authenticity of the tale.

Next we have a long account, but whence taken we know not, of the case of Anne Askew, who suffered for denying the real presence. Upwards of seven pages are devoted to this lady's examinations, which are pretended to be given from her own pen. We do not find that Burnet is very elaborate in his detail of her trial, and Dr. Lingard mentions a fact or two but little known to the generality of the people. This lady, was married to one Kyme, but left her husband, and assumed her maiden name of Askew, that she might practise the work of an apostle more freely, along with another female, who was afterwards burned by Tom Cranmer's order. This woman was evidently an enthusiast, like our modern Johanna Southcott, though she did not possess so much cunning as the latter, and lived in more violent times. She got it into her head that Christ was not present in the blessed eucharist, though the fathers and all the world, from the time of the apostles, believed He was; and as it was against the act of the six articles, she was condemned to be burned for her contumacy, and suffered, after two recantation, in 1546. The council book mentions that on

June 19th, in that year, "both Kyme and his wife were called before the lords; that the former was sent home to remain there till he was sent for; and that the latter, who refused him to be her husband, without alleging any honest allegation, for that she was very obstinate and heady in reasoning matters of religion, wherein she shewed herself to be of a naughty opinion, seeing no persuasion of good reason could take place, was sent to Newgate, to remain there to answer to law."—*Harl. MS.* 256, fol. 224. Thus it is clear this martyr of Fox's was no other than a crazy madcap; yet is she represented as inspired with the spirit of wisdom, and more learned than all the bishops put together, even with Tom Cranmer at their head. But why is her death to be charged on the Catholics, when Cranmer, the renowned Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and chief pillar of the Reformation, was consenting to this woman's death, although being a Lutheran and a reformer in his heart, he himself did not believe in the doctrine, for rejecting which he consented to the death of this Anne Askew? Oh! let this never be forgotten. When the Protestant bigot is launching forth in the praises of this hero of that thing called the Reformation, let it be rung in his ears, that Cranmer, the vile, the truckling Cranmer, was assenting to the burnings and hangings of Protestant heretics, and Catholic pretended traitors, and never crossed the will of the tyrant he served, whether it was to rob the church and poor of their property, the people of their rights, or the king's wives of their lives. The will of the tyrant was a law for Cranmer, who even preached in favour of despotism and passive obedience.

These burnings, we are told, "were so many triumphs to the Popish party," though the Catholics had no more hand in them than John Fox. The nation was at this time divided into two factions, and the Catholics were as much persecuted for the denying the supremacy of the king, as the hot headed reformers for denying the real presence in the blessed sacrament. How unjust then is it to charge these executions to the account of the Catholics, when they were themselves the



victims of party rage, and were despoiled of their property to gratify the avariciousness of profligate courtiers. Harry, after the death of his fifth wife, who was sent out of the world by severing her head for adultery, married Catharine Parr, who was a widow, and a favourer of the reformers. Of course Cranmer and the queen rowed in the same boat, and it appears a plan was laid by their enemies to bring them both into disgrace. Burnet says, "They persuaded the king that Cranmer was the source of all the heresies in England; but Henry's esteem for him was such, that no one would appear to give evidence against him; they therefore desired that he might be committed to the Tower." Burnet then goes on to tell a story of the king's informing Cranmer of the designs against him, of Tom's fortitude and forbearance, and the king's suggesting a plan to entrap the rogues for daring to cast suspicion on the immaculate prelate and panderer. Of this state of parties Dr. Lingard writes thus:—"During these transactions, the court of Henry was divided by the secret intrigues of the two religious parties, which continued to cherish an implacable hatred against each other. The men of the old religion naturally looked upon Cranmer as their most steady and most dangerous enemy: and, though he was careful not to commit any open transgression of the law, yet the encouragement which he gave to the new preachers, and the clandestine correspondence which he maintained with the German reformers, would have proved his ruin, had he not found a friend and advocate in his sovereign. Henry still retained a grateful recollection of his former services, and felt no apprehension of resistance or treason from a man, who *on all occasions*, whatever were his real opinions or wishes, had moulded his conscience in conformity to the royal will. When the prebendaries of Canterbury lodged an information against him, the king issued a commission to examine, not the accused, but the accusers; of whom some were imprisoned; all were compelled to ask pardon of the archbishop. In the House of Commons Sir John Gostwick, representative for Bedfordshire, had the

boldness to accuse him of heresy: but the king sent a message to the 'varlet,' that if he did not acknowledge his fault, he should be made an example for the instruction of his fellows. On another occasion Henry had consented to the committal of the archbishop; but afterwards he revoked his permission, telling the council that Cranmer was as faithful a man towards him as ever was prelate in the realm, and one to whom he was many ways beholden; or, as another version has it, that he was the *only man* who had *loved his sovereign* so well, as never to have *opposed the royal pleasure*. In like manner Gardiner, from his acknowledged abilities and his credit with the king, was to the men of the new learning a constant object of suspicion and jealousy. To ruin him in the royal estimation, it was pretended that he had communicated with the papal agents through the imperial ministers; and that, while he pretended to be zealously attached to the interests of the king, he had in reality made his peace with the pontiff. But it was in vain that the accusation was repeatedly urged, and that Gardiner's secretary was even tried, convicted, and executed on a charge of having denied the supremacy: the caution of the bishop bade defiance to the wiles and malice of his enemies. Aware of the danger which threatened him, he stood constantly on his guard; and though he might prompt the zeal, and second the efforts of those who wished well to the ancient faith, he made it a rule never to originate any religious measure, nor to give his opinion on religious subjects, without the express command of his sovereign. Then he was accustomed to speak his mind with boldness: but though he might sometimes offend the pride, still he preserved the esteem of Henry, who, unmoved by the suggestions of his adversaries, continued to employ him in affairs of state, and to consult him on questions of religion. As often, indeed, as he was absent in embassies to foreign courts, Cranmer improved the favourable moment to urge the king to a further reformation. He was heard with attention; he was even twice desired to form the necessary plan, to subjoin his reasons, and to submit them to the royal con-

sideration : still, however, Henry paused to receive the opinion of Gardiner ; and, swayed by his advice, rejected or suspended the execution of the measures proposed by the metropolitan." Hence it is clear that what was done by the two factions, was prompted by self-interest and passion, while the good of the commonwealth was suffered to decay, as we shall take occasion to shew.

The next story is the lucky escape of Catharine Parr from the trap that was laid to shorten her life, and the death of the tyrant himself. As we have noticed the judgments that befel this obdurate and beastly head of the church of England in a former number, it is not necessary to repeat them here. Suffice it to say, he died on the 27th of January, 1547, in the 56th year of his age, and the 38th of his reign, execrated by thousands and regretted by none. The editors are obliged to confess that he was a monster in cruelty, and that "almost the last act of his life was one of barbarous ingratitude and monstrous tyranny ;" but then they basely attempted to screen the cruelties of this barbarian, by insinuating that he was urged to these atrocious acts by the machinations of the pope and the clergy. Here, reader, is what they say, which we see is copied from Burnet :—"The severities Henry used against many of his subjects, in matters of religion, made both sides write with great sharpness against him ; his temper was imperious and cruel ; he was sudden and violent in his passions, and hesitated at nothing by which he could gratify either his lust or his revenge. This was much provoked by the sentence of the pope against him, by the virulent books cardinal Pole and others published, by the rebellions that were raised in England by the Popish clergy, and the apprehensions he was in of the emperor's greatness, together with his knowledge of the fate of those princes against whom the popes had thundered in former times ; all which made him think it necessary to keep his people under the terror of a severe government ; and by some public examples, to secure the peace of the nation, and thereby to prevent a more profuse effusion of blood, which might have

otherwise followed if he had been more gentle; and it was no wonder, if after the pope deposed him, he proceeded to great severities against all who supported the papal authority." We may here see the malignity of Burnet, whose disregard for truth was only equalled by his malicious insinuations against the Catholic clergy. Now it is well known by those who have consulted history, that the pope did not proceed to extremities until Henry had been guilty of the grossest violations of his coronation oath, and had shed the blood of his innocent subjects and best friends. Of the writings of cardinal Pole, it does not appear by the catalogue of his works in Dodd, that he wrote more than one volume folio in the lifetime of Henry, and surely it will not be contended, that the subsequent writings of the cardinal were the cause of Henry's cruelties. The rebellions raised in England were occasioned not by the clergy, but by the king himself, in sanctioning measures by which the clergy were stripped of their possessions and the poor of their support and rights. And if the modern editors agree with Gilbert Burnet, that it was "necessary to keep his people under the terror of a severe government; and by some public examples to secure the peace of the nation, and thereby prevent a more profuse effusion of blood, which *might* otherwise have followed if he had been more *gentle*;" why do they make such a parade of the martyrs which they say suffered during his reign? Burnet, after making these remarks, gave a long list of Catholics who suffered in consequence of refusing to admit the king's supremacy, but the modern editors have not been so candid as the authority from whom they borrow. Instead of these real Catholic martyrs, they have introduced a number of pretended sufferers, occupying fourteen pages of the veriest nonsense and absurdities ever submitted to a credulous people. As the greater part is evidently fictitious and grossly inconsistent, we shall pass by these unauthorized details, and conclude the eventful period of Henry's reign with Dr. Lingard's account of his character, and the consequences of the measures pursued by him, during the course of his government of this realm:—

“To form a just estimate of the character of Henry, we must distinguish between the young king, guided by the counsels of Wolsey, and the monarch of more mature age, governing by his own judgment, and with the aid of ministers selected and fashioned by himself. In his youth, the beauty of his person, the elegance of his manners, and his adroitness in every martial and fashionable exercise, were calculated to attract the admiration of his subjects. His court was gay and splendid; a succession of amusements seemed to absorb his attention: yet his pleasures were not permitted to encroach on his more important duties: he assisted at the council, perused the dispatches, and corresponded with his generals and ambassadors: nor did the minister, trusted and powerful as he was, dare to act, till he had asked the opinion and taken the pleasure of his sovereign. His natural abilities had been improved by study: and his esteem for literature may be inferred from the learned education which he gave to his children, and from the number of eminent scholars to whom he granted pensions in foreign states, or on whom he conferred promotion in his own. The immense treasure which he inherited from his father, was perhaps a misfortune; because it engendered habits of expense not to be supported by the ordinary revenue of the crown: and the soundness of his politics may be doubted, which, under the pretence of supporting the balance of power, repeatedly involved the nation in continental hostilities. Yet even these errors served to throw a lustre round the English throne, and raised its possessor in the eyes of his own subjects and of the different nations of Europe. But as the king advanced in age, his vices gradually developed themselves: after the death of Wolsey they were indulged without restraint. He became as rapacious as he was prodigal: as obstinate as he was capricious: as fickle in his friendships as he was merciless in his resentments. Though liberal of his confidence, he soon grew suspicious of those whom he had ever trusted; and, as if he possessed no other right to the crown than that which he derived from the very questionable claim of his father, he



viewed with an evil eye every remote descendant of the Plantagenets: and eagerly embraced the slightest pretexts to remove those whom his jealously represented as future rivals to himself or his posterity. In pride and vanity he was perhaps without a parallel. Inflated with the praises of interested admirers, he despised the judgment of others; acted as if he deemed himself infallible in matters of policy and religion; and seemed to look upon dissent from his opinion as equivalent to a breach of allegiance. In his estimation, to submit and to obey, were the great, the paramount duties of subjects: and this persuasion steeled his breast against remorse for the blood which he shed, and led him to trample without scruple on the liberties of the nation.

“When he ascended the throne, there still existed a spirit of freedom, which, on more than one occasion, defeated the arbitrary measures of the court, though directed by an able minister and supported by the authority of the sovereign: but in the lapse of a few years that spirit had fled, and before the death of Henry, the king of England had grown into a despot, the people had shrunk into a *nation of slaves*. The causes of this important change in the relations between the sovereign and his subjects, may be found not so much in the abilities or passions of the former, as in the *obsequiousness of his parliaments*, the *assumption of the ecclesiastical supremacy*, and the *servility of the two religious parties which divided the nation*.

“The house of peers no longer consisted of those powerful lords and prelates, who, in former periods, had so often and so successfully resisted the encroachments of the sovereign. The reader has already witnessed the successive steps, by which most of the great families of the preceding reigns had become extinct, and their immense possessions had been frittered away among the favourites and dependants of the court. The most opulent of the peers under Henry were poor in comparison with their predecessors: and by the operation of the statute against liveries, they had lost the accustomed means of arming their retainers in support of their quarrels. In

general they were new men, indebted for their present honours and estates to the bounty of Henry or of his father: and the proudest, among the rest, by witnessing the attainders and execution of others, had been taught to tremble for themselves, and to crouch in submission at the foot of a master, whose policy it was to depress the great, and punish their errors without mercy, while he selected his favourites from the lower classes, heaping on them honours and riches, and confiding to them the exercise of his authority.

“By the separation of the realm from the see of Rome, the dependence of the spiritual had been rendered still more complete than that of the temporal peers. Their riches had been diminished, their immunities taken away: the support which they might have derived from the protection of the pontiff was gone: they were nothing more than the delegates of the king, exercising a precarious authority, determinable at his pleasure. The ecclesiastical constitutions, which had so long formed part of the law of the land, now depended on his *breath*, and were executed only by his *sufferance*. The convocation, indeed, continued to be summoned; but its legislative authority was no more. Its principal business was to grant money; yet even those grants now owed their force, not to the consent of the grantors, but to the approbation of the other two houses, and the assent of the crown.

“As for the third branch of the legislature, the commons of England, they had not yet acquired sufficient importance to oppose any effectual barrier to the power of the sovereign, yet care was taken that among them the leading members should be devoted to the crown, and that the speaker should be one holding office, or high in the confidence of the ministers. Freedom of debate was, indeed, granted: but with a qualification which, in reality, amounted to a refusal. It was only a *decent* freedom: and, as the king reserved to himself the right of deciding what was or was not decent, he frequently put down the opponents of the court, by reprimanding the “varlets” in person, or by sending to them a threatening message.

“It is plain that from parliaments thus constituted, the crown had little to fear: and though Wolsey had sought to govern without their aid, Henry found them so obsequious to his will that he convoked them repeatedly, and was careful to have his most wanton and despotic measures sanctioned with their approbation. The parliament, so often as it was opened or closed, by the king in person, offered a scene not unworthy of an oriental divan. The form indeed differed but little from our present usage. The king sate on his throne; on the right hand stood the chancellor, on the left the lord treasurer; whilst the peers were placed on their benches, and the commons stood at the bar. But the addresses made on these occasions by the chancellor or the speaker, usually lasted more than an hour; and their constant theme was the great character of the king. The orators, in their efforts to surpass each other, fed his vanity with the most hyperbolical praise. Cromwell was unable, he believed all men were unable, to describe the unutterable qualities of the royal mind, the sublime virtues of the royal heart. Rich told him, that in wisdom he was equal to Solomon, in strength and courage to Sampson, in beauty and address to Absalom; and Audeley declared before his face, that God had anointed him with the oil of wisdom above his fellows, above the other kings of the earth, above all his predecessors; had given him a perfect knowledge of the scriptures, with which he had prostrated the Roman Goliath; a perfect knowledge of the art of war, by which he had gained the most brilliant victories at the same time in remote places; and a perfect knowledge of the art of government, by which he had for thirty years secured to his own realm the blessings of peace, while all the other nations of Europe suffered the calamities of war.

“During these harangues, as often as the words, ‘most sacred majesty,’ were repeated, or as any emphatic expression was pronounced, the lords rose, and the whole assembly, in token of respect and assent, bowed profoundly to the demigod on the throne. Henry himself affected to hear such

fulsome adulation with indifference. His answer was invariably the same : that he laid no claim to superior excellence ; but that, if he did possess it, he gave the glory to God, the author of all good gifts ; it was, however, a pleasure to him to witness the affection of his subjects, and to learn that they were not insensible of the blessings which they enjoyed under his government.

“ It is evident that the new dignity of head of the church, by transferring to the king that authority which had been hitherto exercised by the pontiff, must have considerably augmented the influence of the crown ; but, in addition, the arguments by which it was supported tended to debase the spirit of the people, and to exalt the royal prerogative above law and equity. When the adversaries of the supremacy asked in what passage of the sacred writings the government of the church was given to a layman, its advocates boldly appealed to those texts which prescribe obedience to the established authorities. The king, they maintained, was the image of God upon earth : to disobey his commands was to disobey God himself : to limit his authority, when no limit was laid down, was an offence against the sovereign : and to make distinctions, when the scripture made none, was an impiety against God. It was, indeed, acknowledged that this supreme authority might be employed unreasonably and unjustly, but even then to resist was a crime ; it became the duty of the sufferer to submit, and his only resource was to pray that the heart of his oppressor might be changed, his only consolation to reflect that the king himself would be summoned to answer for his conduct before a future and unerring tribunal. Henry became a sincere believer in a doctrine so flattering to his pride ; and easily persuaded himself that he did no more than his duty in punishing with severity the least opposition to his will. To impress it on the minds of the people, it was perpetually inculcated from the pulpit : it was enforced in books of controversy and instruction : it was promulgated with authority in the ‘ Institution,’ and afterwards in the ‘ Erudition of a Christian Man.’ From

*that period* the doctrine of *passive obedience* formed a leading trait in the orthodox creed.

“The two great parties, into which religious disputes had separated the nation, contributed also to strengthen the despotic power of Henry. They were too jealous of each other to watch, much less to resist, the encroachments of the crown. The great object of both was the same,—to win the favour of the king, that they might crush the power of their adversaries; and with this view they flattered his vanity, submitted to his caprice, and became the obsequious slaves of his pleasure. Henry, on the other hand, whether it were through policy or accident, played them off against each other; sometimes appearing to lean to the old, sometimes to the new doctrines, alternately raising and depressing the hopes of each, but never suffering either party to obtain the complete ascendancy over its opponent. Thus he kept them in a state of dependance on his will, and secured their concurrence to every measure which his passion or caprice might suggest, without regard to reason or justice, or the fundamental laws of the land. Of the extraordinary enactments which followed, a few instances may suffice. The succession to the crown was repeatedly altered, and at length left to the king’s private judgment or affection. The right was first taken from Mary, and given to Elizabeth; then transferred from Elizabeth to the king’s issue by Jane Seymour, or any future queen; next, restored, on the failure of issue by prince Edward, to both Mary and Elizabeth; and lastly, failing issue by them, to any person or persons to whom it should please him to assure it in remainder by his last will. Treasons were multiplied by the most vexatious, and often, if ridicule could attach to so grave a matter, by the most ridiculous laws. It was once treason to dispute, it was afterwards treason to maintain, the validity of the marriage with Anne Boleyn, or the legitimacy of her daughter. It became treason to marry, without the royal licence, any of the king’s children, whether legitimate or natural, or his paternal brothers or sisters, or their issue; or for any woman to



marry the king himself, unless she were a maid, or had previously revealed to him her former incontinence. It was made treason to call the king a heretic or a schismatic, openly to wish him harm, or to slander him, his wife, or his issue. This, the most heinous of crimes in the eye of the law, was extended from deeds and assertions to the very *thoughts* of men. Its guilt was incurred by any person who should, by words, writing, imprinting, or any other exterior act, directly or indirectly accept or take, judge or *believe*, that either of the royal marriages, that with Catharine, or that with Anne Boleyn, was valid, or who should protest that he was not bound to declare his opinion, or should refuse to swear that he would answer truly such questions as should be asked him on those dangerous subjects. It would be difficult to discover, under the most despotic governments, a law more cruel and absurd. The validity or invalidity of the two marriages was certainly matter of opinion, supported and opposed on each side by so many contradictory arguments, that men of the soundest judgment might reasonably be expected to differ from each other. Yet Henry, by this statute, was authorized to dive into the breast of every individual, to extort from him his secret sentiments upon oath, and to subject him to the penalty of treason, if those sentiments did not accord with the royal pleasure. The king was made, in a great measure, independent of parliament, by two statutes, one of which gave to his proclamations the force of laws, the other appointed a tribunal, consisting of nine privy counsellors, with power to punish all transgressors of such proclamations. The dreadful punishment of heresy was not confined to those who rejected the doctrines which had already been declared orthodox, but it was extended beforehand to all persons who should teach or maintain any opinion contrary to such doctrines as the king might afterwards publish. If the criminal were a clergyman, he was to expiate his third offence at the stake; if a layman, to forfeit his personal property, and be imprisoned for life. Thus was Henry invested, *by act of parliament*, with the high prerogative of *theological infalli-*

*bility*, and an obligation was laid on all men, without exception, whether of the new or of the old learning, to model their religious opinions and religious practice by the *sole judgment* of their sovereign. By an *ex post facto* law, those who had taken the first oath against the papal authority, were reputed to have taken, and to be bound by a second and more comprehensive oath, which was afterwards enacted, and which, perhaps, had it been tendered to them, they would have refused.

“ But that which made the severity of these statutes the more terrible, was the manner in which criminal prosecutions were then conducted. The crown could hardly fail in convicting the prisoner, whatever were his guilt or his innocence. He was first interrogated in his cell, urged with the hope of pardon to make a confession, or artfully led by ensnaring questions into dangerous admissions. When the materials of the prosecution were completed, they were laid before the grand inquest, and if the bill was found, the conviction of the accused might be pronounced certain, for in the trial which followed, the real question submitted to the decision of the petit jury was, which of the two were more worthy of credit, the prisoner who maintained his innocence, or the grand inquest which had pronounced his guilt. With this view the indictment, with a summary of the proofs on which it had been found, was read; and the accused, now perhaps for the first time acquainted with the nature of the evidence against him, was indulged with the liberty of speaking in his own defence. Still he could not insist on the production of his accusers that he might obtain the benefit of cross-examination; nor claim the aid of counsel to repel the taunts, and unravel the sophistry, which were too often employed at that period by the advocates for the crown. In this method of trial, every chance was in favour of the prosecution; and yet it was gladly exchanged for the expedient discovered by Cromwell, and afterwards employed against its author. Instead of a public trial, the minister introduced a bill of attainder into parliament, accompanied with such documents

as he thought proper to submit. It was passed by the two houses with all convenient expedition; and the unfortunate prisoner found himself condemned to the scaffold or the gallows, without the opportunity of opening his mouth in his own vindication.

“To proceed by attainder became the usual practice in the latter portion of the king's reign. It was more certain in the result, by depriving the accused of the few advantages which he possessed in the ordinary courts; it enabled the minister to gratify the royal suspicion or resentment without the danger of refutation, or of unpleasant disclosures; and it satisfied the minds of the people, who, unacquainted with the real merits of the case, could not dispute the equity of a judgment given with the unanimous consent of the whole legislature.

“Thus it was that, by the obsequiousness of the parliament, the assumption of the ecclesiastical supremacy, and the servility of religious factions, Henry acquired and exercised the most despotic sway over the lives, the fortunes, and the liberties of his subjects. Happily the forms of a free government were still suffered to exist: into these forms a spirit of resistance to arbitrary power gradually infused itself: the pretensions of the crown were opposed by the claims of the people, and the result of a long and arduous struggle was that constitution which for more than a century has excited the envy and the admiration of Europe.”

With this account from the pen of one of the first writers of the day, we shall close our review of the transactions of the reformers during the portentous rule of the wife-killer and priest-slayer. The reader will now be able to see the rueful consequences of submitting to the will of an arbitrary tyrant, and the direful effects which followed the investment of Henry with the supreme ecclesiastical authority of the church. The people of England have been taught to look upon the rejection of the pope's supremacy as the dawn of the nation's liberties, whereas it is clear that this event led to the most arbitrary and unjust laws, and entailed upon the people the

most deplorable miseries. Oh, England! what hast thou suffered since thou departed from the faith of the apostles, and separated thyself from the communion of the Christian world!

PERSECUTIONS IN SCOTLAND DURING THE FIFTEENTH AND  
PART OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

We are now going to reconnoitre the transactions in the northern part of the island, where the “saints” were more violent than those who put some of them to death. PERSECUTION is a word familiar to every person in this country, but though every one knows its meaning, it is not every individual who is sufficiently acquainted with history to know whether the term is correctly applied to the circumstance. To *persecute*, we are told by Dr. Johnson, is “to harass with penalties; to pursue with malignity—to pursue with repeated acts of vengeance or enmity;” and it will be seen, when the reader is put in possession of both sides of the question, that the charge of persecution will apply with much more justice to the reforming party, who are represented as being persecuted, than to those who are described as persecuting. We have, in the preceding remarks, been considering the progress of the Reformation, so called, under the protection of the government of the country, the head of that government having thrown off the submission exacted by the divine founder of true religion to his church, and assumed the supremacy of that portion of it in England himself. The case, however, was different in Scotland. There the Catholic religion was the religion of the state, as it was in England before Henry’s usurpation, and the temporal authorities yielded the same obedience to the spiritual supremacy of the church as the other Catholic sovereigns did. The attempt, therefore, of the reformers to introduce their new-fangled notions into Scotland, and create confusion, was an *innovation* on the constituted authorities, and being such, it was natural that the attempt would be resisted. We are aware that the Catholic religion was introduced and established in the

Roman empire, and in almost every place, in opposition to "the powers that be," and that persecution was practised to stop its progress, but without effect. But we must here observe, that the apostles, and their successors afterwards, in disseminating this holy faith, invariably abstained from mixing the affairs of this world with the kingdom they laboured to establish, which, they said, was *not* of this world, and that it did not interfere with the temporal concerns of the different states in existence, but was calculated for one form or constitution as well as another, and, indeed, gave security to all, by inculcating the doctrine of obedience to the established forms of government. In no instance whatever do we read in history that the introduction of the Catholic or Christian religion produced disorder or destruction to the kingdoms or empires that received it. On the contrary, we see by the annals of our own country, that those monarchs who were the most celebrated for their attachment and devotion to the Catholic church, and who listened to the advice and admonitions of the most pious and sainted dignitaries of that church, were equally eminent for the establishment of just and wholesome laws, the protection they thus afforded to the lives and property of their subjects, and the consequent absence of all harsh and tyrannic measures, which only tend to brutalize and debase a people. To monarchs such as these do Englishmen owe all that is good and excellent in that civil constitution of which they make such a boast, though most of its privileges have been suppressed since the period of the Reformation, so called, and to be eligible to the remainder it is required to be sworn that the holy founders were DAMNABLE IDOLATERS !

It was not so, however, with the reformers ; though they declaimed against the supposed errors of the Catholic church, with all the vehemence they were capable of, yet they found their cause made very little progress, until they instigated the ignorant and illiterate people to violence and rebellion, and thus sought by revolutionary means to subdue those in authority who were opposed to the wild notions they propagated, and grasped the civil sword to assist them in silencing



the voice of truth and justice. In every country where the clamour of Protestantism was heard against the ruling powers, sedition, rebellion, and treason followed in its train; and where it was ushered in by the sanction of the civil magistrate, it was preceded by robbery, sacrilege, and murder. We have seen by the transactions in Henry's reign the accuracy of the latter observation; it remains then to be shewn how far we are correct with regard to the former. The reformers of Scotland imbibed the notions of John Calvin, who, in his commentaries on Daniel, says, "Princes forfeit their power when they oppose God in opposing the Reformation; and it is better, in such cases, to spit in their faces than to obey." Beza, Calvin's scholar, in his book, "*Vindicæ, contra Tyrannos*," says, "We must obey kings for God's sake, when they obey God;" but otherwise, "as the vassal loses his fief or tenure, if he commit felony, so does the king lose his right to the realm also." Such doctrines could not fail to produce turbulent and riotous disciples, as the sequel will shew.

Fox, in the modern edition of the *Book of Martyrs*, commences his account of the Scottish persecutions, as he calls them, with the following prefatory observations:—"Having brought our account of the sufferings and martyrdoms of the English reformers down to the death of Henry VIII., we shall now proceed to relate the *cruel persecutions* of God's *faithful servants* in Scotland, to the same period; but it will previously be necessary to give a short sketch of the progress of the Reformation in that country. The long alliance between Scotland and France, had rendered the two nations extremely attached to each other; and Paris was the place where the learned of Scotland had their education. Yet *early* in the *fifteenth* century, *learning was more encouraged in Scotland*, and universities were founded in several *episcopal* sees. About the same time some of Wickliffe's followers began to show themselves in Scotland; and an *Englishman*, named Resby, was burnt in 1407 for teaching some opinions contrary to the pope's authority. Some years

after that, Paul Crow, a *Bohemian*, who had been converted by Huss, was burnt for infusing the opinions of that martyr into some persons at St. Andrew's. About the end of the fifteenth century, Lollardy, as it was then called, spread itself into many parts of the diocese of Glasgow, for which several persons *of quality* were accused; but they answered the archbishop of that see with so much boldness and truth, that he *dismissed them*, having *admonished* them to content themselves with the *faith of the church*, and to beware of *new doctrines*. The *same* spirit of *ignorance, immorality, and superstition*, had over-run the church of Scotland that was so much complained of in other parts of Europe. The total neglect of the pastoral care, and the scandalous lives of the clergy, filled the people with such prejudices against them, that they were easily disposed to hearken to new preachers, among the most conspicuous of whom was Patrick Hamilton." Early in the fifteenth century, we are told, learning was more encouraged in Scotland than before, that universities were founded by several bishops, and yet before the close of this same century the country is represented as over-run with ignorance, immorality, and superstition! But mark, reader, it does not appear from this account that any one was burned before the year 1407, yet the Catholic religion had been the religion of Scotland upwards of nine hundred years. Can this be a persecuting religion? The occasion of this burning, we are informed, was the introduction of some of Wickliffe's followers, and what sort of religionists these Wickliffites were we have already shewn the reader in the preceding pages. They have been shewn to be spoliators and rebels, and were punished for their violations of the peace of society, rather than their religious notions. To represent such men as "God's servants" is rank blasphemy, and cannot be too strongly reprobated; but so it is with the interested opposers of Catholicism, that wherever they meet a man who is a reviler of the pope and the Catholic clergy, who is a clamourer against the supposed errors and corruptions of the church of Rome, though, in other respects he should be the vilest and

most perfidious character, yet will they represent him as the most immaculate of human beings, and the chastisement he may receive for his outrages on the laws of society, as a persecution for his *religious* notions. Of Paul Craw we have no authentic account; he is stated to have been converted by Huss, but, from the life and conduct of this Huss, it should have been *corrupted*. Then Lollardism spread itself in many parts of the diocese of Glasgow, and several persons of quality became infected with it, who, on being accused before the archbishop, answered with so much boldness and *truth*, it is said, that they were only admonished "to content themselves with the faith of the church, and to beware of *new* doctrines." Well, as we are told to adhere to the faith *once* delivered to the saints, whatever is *new* cannot be that faith *once* delivered, and therefore the advice given must be acknowledged to have been good. Next comes an account of "the spirit of ignorance, immorality, and superstition," which infected all parts of Europe, and at length contaminated Scotland. When we read this part of the account we fancied the editors were alluding to the present state of a certain church, in which we find a "total neglect of the pastoral care, and the scandalous lives of many of the clergy," daily filling the people with disgust and indignation at such conduct, and causing them to run to conventicles to hearken to other preachers. We are ready to admit, nay we have frequently admitted, that there was a laxity in morals among many of the clergy at the close of the fifteenth century; for if this had not been the case, we should not have had such beastly and depraved characters as the chief of the reformers were, namely, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Zuinglius, Melancthon, Ecolampadius, and many others, whose immoral doctrines, coupled with the impiety of their lives, soon covered that part of the world where they had taken root with the most horrible scenes of lewdness and wickedness. We have before given the admissions of the reformers of this state of things; it is not necessary, therefore, to repeat them here, but we will proceed to notice the martyrs of this pretended persecution.

The first we see upon the list is Patrick Hamilton, the nephew of the earl of Arran, and by his mother's side the duke of Albany. This reformer is represented as having become acquainted with Luther and Melancthon, "and being convinced, from his own researches, of the TRUTH OF THEIR DOCTRINES, he burned to impart the light of the gospel to his own countrymen, and to shew them the errors and corruptions of their own church." Before we proceed further, it may not be amiss to remind the reader of some of Luther's doctrines, that he may judge for himself what excellent use our reformers made of their researches, and how correct their convictions must have been. Here then are a few specimens of Luther's doctrines taken from his own works.—"God's commandments are all equally impossible." (*De Lib. Christ.* t. ii. fol. 4.) "No sins can damn a man, but only unbelief." (*De Captiv. Bab.* t. ii. fol. 171.) "God is just, though by his own will he lays us under the necessity of being damned; and though he damns those that have not deserved it." (t. ii. fol. 434, 436.) "God works in us both good and evil." (t. ii. fol. 44.) That the reader shudders at these horrible and blasphemous doctrines we feel convinced; but what are we to think of those men who, in the nineteenth century, have held forth the propagator of these diabolical notions as the paragon of Christian perfection, and his disciple Hamilton as "a godly martyr." Patrick, it is said, denied the doctrine of free will, which was taught by the apostles, and advocated the impious notion of justification by faith alone. Now, by this doctrine, a man was taught that though he committed the most heinous offence in the eyes of God, whether of murder, adultery, or any other immorality, he had only to *believe* himself a saint, and nothing could damn him. Such pestiferous notions were sufficient to set open the floodgates of vice, and it became the duty of every well-wisher to morality and good order, to stop the current of devilism thus about to be spread over the kingdom. Hamilton was accordingly condemned as a heretic, and sentenced to the flames, which sentence was put into execution in the year

1527, under circumstances, the account says, of refined cruelty. We are not, as we have often said before, the advocate of these burnings, but, in the absence of authentic testimony, and taking into consideration the doctrines imbibed and preached by Patrick Hamilton, we think there can be but little doubt that he was condemned and suffered, not for his speculative opinions, but for the immorality and seditiousness of his doctrines. The *Book of Martyrs* says, "The views and doctrines of this *glorious martyr* were such as would not fail to excite the highest admiration of every *real believer*; and they were expressed with such brevity and clearness, and such peculiar vigour and beauty (forming in themselves a complete summary of the gospel), that they afforded instruction to all who sought to know more of God." This is true sectarian cant. Why, if his views and doctrines were of such peculiar excellence—why, we ask, were they not carefully preserved for the edification and instruction of future generations? Catholics have carefully preserved the writings and testimonies of the fathers from the primitive age of Christianity: they have recourse to them as witnesses of the unity and impeccability of the Catholic faith; why then was not this complete summary of the gospel by Hamilton preserved by his disciples as a reference for every real believer? The fact is, Hamilton's views and doctrines would not bear a strict scrutiny, and we question whether they were ever put on paper. The account is a fabrication intended to excite prejudice against the Catholics and enthusiasm for the reformed, or rather deformed, doctrines.

The next martyr is one Henry Forest, described as a *young friar* of Lithgow. This disciple of the Reformation is said to have fallen a victim for his faith by going—where do you suppose, reader?—by going to CONFESSION, and there SECRETLY disclosing his conscience. He told his confessor, "that he thought Hamilton to be a good man, and wrongfully put to death, and that his doctrines were *true*, and not heretical: upon which [the relation continues] the friar," whom Forest had caused to hear his confession, "came and



related to the bishop the confession which he had received. This was taken as sufficient evidence against him; and he was accordingly declared to be 'a heretic, equal in iniquity with Patrick Hamilton,' and sentenced to suffer death." Here we have another most improbable story; for if Forest believed the doctrines of Hamilton to have been true, why did he follow the Popish custom of confession, which all the other reformers renounced with the doctrine of good works? This is a bungling tale, and proclaims its own falsehood. Had he been what he is represented, he would not have chosen secrecy for a disclosure of his conversion, but we may naturally suppose that he would have made an open profession of his faith, as the martyrs under the Roman heathen emperors did. Neither is it likely that his judges should rely only on the statement of his confessor, whose conduct, by the by, would have been reprobated in the strongest terms, as it is held one of the greatest sacrileges that can be committed, and there is no authenticated instance of such a disclosure having ever been made. Why should the proceedings against the young friar be more summary than those against Hamilton? Why had he not a trial; and why was he not called upon to abjure? It is, as we before said, a bungling tale, and enough has been said to shew its improbability.

We have now *two* martyrs, one named Norman Gourlay, and the other David Stratton. They both are said to have denied there being such a place as purgatory, and the former would have it, "that the pope was not a bishop, but Antichrist, and had no jurisdiction in Scotland;" the latter contended, "that the passion of Christ was the only expiation for sin, and that the tribulations of this world were the only sufferings that the saints underwent." What rank and condition of life Gourlay moved in we are not informed, but David, we are told, was a fisherman, and we suppose considered himself as well calculated to expound the mysteries of religion—fifteen hundred years after it had been established—as the apostles, some of whom were fishermen, who were personally commissioned by Christ to teach his truths, and

inspired by the Holy Ghost to fulfil their commission. Whether the martyrs, Norman and David, would have remained unmolested, if David had not proved refractory with his vicar, we cannot tell, but the story informs us that the vicar asked David for his tithe-fish, and that David cast them out of the boat in so negligent a manner that some of them fell into the sea. Now this was very naughty of David, because the vicar did not appropriate the tithes wholly to his own use, as the parsons do now-a-days under a Protestant reformed establishment, but he divided the tithes among the poor, the sick, the widow, and the stranger, and it was therefore an ill-natured trick of Davy, the fisherman, to prevent the Catholic vicar from performing these charitable acts. Well, for his silly behaviour, he got accused of "having said that no tithes should be paid;" and forthwith we find him and his companion, Gourlay, before the archbishop; but how Gourlay came into custody we have no information. In the end they were "condemned as obstinate heretics, and sentenced to be burnt upon the green side, between Leith and Edinburgh, with a view to strike terror into the surrounding country." How "the surrounding country" was to be terrified by this execution, is not explained to such of the good people as may read this famous *Book of Martyrs*; however, it is said they addressed the spectators, and continued to preach so long that the officers were under the necessity of stopping them. A moment's reflection, we think, is sufficient to shew the falsity of this relation. When we look at the state of letters in those times, and consider that literary knowledge was chiefly confined to the clergy and persons destined for the orders of the church; when we take into consideration that printing was then scarcely known, and consequently that books were not so familiar to the working classes as they are now; is it probable, we ask, that a poor fisherman should be able to teach and discuss such knotty points as the mysteries of religion, or that he should know better what to believe than all the learned men in the world for fifteen hundred years before him? To entertain such an

idea would be to proclaim a defect of common sense, yet is such trash sent forth in these "enlightened" days, as they are called, to excite a hatred against the greater part of the Christian world.

The next story of martyrdom is still more ridiculous, and we shall not do justice to it unless we give it as it is related. The book says:—"Not long after the burning of Stratton and Gourlay, dean Thomas Forret was accused to the bishop of Dunkeld, as 'a heretic, and one that shewed the mysteries of the scriptures to the vulgar people in their own language, to make the clergy detestable in their sight.'

"The bishop of Dunkeld said to him, 'I love you well, and therefore I must give you my counsel, how you shall rule and guide yourself. My dear dean Thomas, I am informed that you preach the epistle or gospel every Sunday to your parishioners, and that you take not the cow, nor the uppermost cloth, from your parishioners, which is very prejudicial to the churchmen; and, therefore, I would you took your cow, and your uppermost cloth, as other churchmen do, or else it is too much to preach every Sunday; for, in so doing you may make the people think that *we* should preach likewise. But it is enough for you, when you find any good epistle, or any good gospel, that setteth forth the liberty of the holy church, to preach that and let the rest be.'

"Forret answered, 'My lord, I think that none of my parishioners will complain that I take not the cow, nor the uppermost cloth, but will gladly give me the same, together with any other thing that they have; and I will give and communicate with them any thing that I have; and so, my lord, we agree right well, and there is no discord among us. And where your lordship saith, "it is too much to preach every Sunday," indeed I think it is too little; and also would wish that your lordship did the like.' 'Nay, nay, dean Thomas,' cried the bishop, 'let that be, for we are not ordained to preach.'

"Then said Forret, 'Where your lordship biddeth me preach when I find any good epistle, or a good gospel; truly,

my lord, I have read the New Testament and the Old, and all the epistles and gospels, and among them all I could never find an evil epistle, or an evil gospel; but if your lordship will shew me the good epistle, and the good gospel, and the evil epistle, and the evil gospel, then I shall preach the good and omit the evil.'

"The bishop replied, '*I thank God that I never knew what the Old and New Testament was*; therefore, dean Thomas, I will know nothing but my portuise and pontifical. Go your way, and let be all these fantasies, for if you persevere in these erroneous opinions, ye will repent when you may not mend it.'

"Forret said, 'I trust my cause is just in the presence of God; and, therefore, I heed not much what may follow thereupon;' and so he departed.

"A short time afterwards he was summoned to appear before cardinal Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrew's; and, after a short examination, he was condemned to be burnt as a heretic. A similar sentence was pronounced, at the same time, on four other persons, named Killor, Beverage, Simson, and Foster; and they were all burnt together on the castle-hill at Edinburgh, February 28, 1538."

Having gone through this relation, we will now ask the reader if he ever met with such an improbable relation before? Mercy upon us! what must be the state of that man's intellect, who could give credit to such absurdity as this? We hear much of the superior excellence of Protestant intellectual capacity; but can those who give credit to such barefaced falsehoods as we have detected in this *Book of Martyrs* be fit for any thing but to inhabit a bedlam? The recommendation of the bishop to the dean to take the cow and the uppermost cloth of the parishioners had been better omitted; because it reminds us too closely of the griping dispositions of the Protestant established clergy in Ireland, to take the poor half-starved peasants' potato, and many is the time that the cow and sheep have been seized from the poor man, notwithstanding they were the support of his helpless family, to

satiate the avarice of the unfeeling rector or his tithe-proctor. But at the time Fox is speaking of, the cow and the cloth did not come within the claims of the clergy, who, not having wives to maintain, as parsons have now-a-days, seldom or ever took the tithe or due to the full demand, but rather assisted the labourer in his difficulties than ruined him when in distress. Neither was it well conceived to hint at the backwardness of the bishop to preach, for we are again reminded that the state bishops in these days are as little prone to preaching as ever the bishop of Dunkeld could be. But when the bishop is made to say that they (bishops) "are not ordained to preach;" when he is made to "thank God that he never knew what the Old and New Testament was," the lie is so palpable, so openly barefaced, that we blush for the depravity of that mind that could be so base, so lost to shame, as to publish it. The bishop not to know what the bible was! when to bishops of the Catholic church we are indebted for the preservation of that sacred volume. The bishop not to know what the Old and New Testament was, though he was compelled by the canons of his church to read certain portions of the scriptures every day in his life, and could not celebrate mass without reading some parts of one or both. Oh! shame, where is thy blush?

It is needless to enter into the details of all the persons selected as martyrs by John Fox; we will therefore be brief with the remainder. Forret and four others are said to have suffered on February 28, 1538, and we have then two more, named Russel and Kenedy, who were taken up the year following, viz. 1539, and executed. Kenedy is described as a youth, eighteen years of age, and being inclined to recant, felt himself suddenly refreshed by *divine inspiration*, and became a *new creature*. They were examined, it is said, but we have no account of the examination; however, being declared heretics, "the *archbishop* [says the book] pronounced the dreadful sentence of death, and they were immediately delivered over to the secular power." Here is another direct falsehood; for in no instance whatever do the clergy pro-



nounce sentence of death on any criminal. They are forbidden to do so by the canons of the church, and it is an invariable rule, at this day, borrowed from our Catholic ancestors, for the bishops to retire from the House of Lords in all cases where that tribunal has to pass sentence on a convicted peer.

The next martyr we shall notice is George Wishart, whose death led to many important events. Nine pages are devoted to the details of this man's proceedings, and contain the veriest cant and absurdity to be met with. Knox, the famous John Knox, who cut such a conspicuous figure in the pillagings, rebellions, and outrages committed in Scotland under pretence of religion, was, it appears, a disciple of George Wishart. The death of this man is, as usual, laid at the door of "the inveterate and persecuting prelate," Cardinal Beaton. To go through the silly sickening detail would tire the reader; we shall, therefore, content ourselves with noticing the account of his execution, to shew the total disregard paid to probability and truth. After being made to address the spectators, telling them to exhort their prelates to learn the word of God, though we always thought the prelates were to instruct the people, the narrative goes on,— "He was then fastened to the stake, and the fagots being lighted, immediately set fire to the powder that was tied about him, and which blew into a flame and smoke. The governor of the castle, who stood so near that he was singed with the flame, exhorted our martyr, in a few words, to be of good cheer, and to ask pardon of God for his offences. To which he replied, 'This flame occasions trouble to my body, indeed, but it hath no wise broken my spirit. But he who now so proudly looks down upon me from yonder lofty place,' pointing to the cardinal, 'shall, ere long, be as ignominiously thrown down, as now he proudly lolls at his ease.' When he had said this, the executioner pulled the rope which was tied about his neck, with great violence, so that he was soon strangled; and the fire getting strength, burnt with such rapidity that in less than an hour his body was totally

consumed." Is there any one in these days credulous enough to believe that the governor was so much of a fool as to place himself so as to be singed with the flames that consumed the sufferer? We think not. Besides we are told, that as soon as Wishart was fastened to the stake, the fagots were lighted which set fire to some powder tied about him, which blew into a flame and smoke. This flame and smoke must have rendered the criminal insensible, and it is, therefore, most unlikely that the governor should address a man stupified by the blowing up of gunpowder, or that the culprit should be able to return such an answer as is imputed to him. But, observe, reader, after blowing up the victim, and then recovering him to reply to the governor, he is provided with a rope round his neck for the executioner to strangle him, which he does, it is said, with great violence, and here ends the martyr's sufferings. This bungling account of his death is sufficient to satisfy every sensible mind that much, at least, of the preceding part of the tale, is romance and fiction.

#### MURDER OF CARDINAL BEATON.

An account of this bloody deed follows the death of Wishart, who was said to have predicted the cardinal's untimely end. We know not from whence Fox obtained the particulars of this event; we have examined Burnet and Heylin, but they differ widely from his narrative. If he copied from Buchanan, the character of this man, thus given by Dr. Heylin, a Protestant writer and divine, in his *Cosmography*, will shew that no reliance is to be placed on his testimony.—“George Buchanan, an ingenious poet, but an unsound statesman; whose History and Dialogue *De jure Regni*, have wrought more mischief in the world than all Machiavel's works.” Dr. Stuart, another Protestant author, says of him:—“His zeal for the earl of Murray, overturned altogether his allegiance as a subject, and his integrity as a man. His activity against Mary in the conferences in England, was a strain of the most shameless corruption; and

the virulence with which he endeavoured to defame her by his writings, was most audacious and criminal. They involve the complicated charge of ingratitude, rebellion, and *perjury*." (*Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 245.) So much for this writer, Buchanan, who may well be classed with Fox and the modern editors. But to the narrative. Fox says the cardinal went to Finhaven to solemnize a marriage between the eldest son of the earl of Crawford, and his own natural daughter, Margaret, and that while there, "he received intelligence that an English squadron was upon the coast, and that consequently an invasion was to be feared. Upon this he immediately returned to St. Andrew's, and appointed a day for the nobility and gentry to meet, and consult what was proper to be done on this occasion." From this statement it would seem that the cardinal was supreme in temporals, as well as in spirituals, or how could he summon the nobility to attend upon him? As to the natural daughter, this is a gratuitous fabrication, to cast a slur on the celibacy of the Catholic clergy, which none of the reformed preachers had the gift to preserve. The appointment of a day of consultation we also deem a fiction; for though the cardinal was, we believe, primate of the Scottish church, he was not the regent of the kingdom, whose province was to guard and protect the country against invasion. The fact is, the kingdom of Scotland was at this time infected with the seditious doctrines of the Genevese reformers, whose horrible cruelties and restless doings we have displayed in our review of the pretended Huguenot martyrs. James V., who reigned in that kingdom, had been solicited by his uncle, Harry of England, to throw off his spiritual obedience to the see of Rome, but refused, and his premature death, leaving an infant daughter, the unfortunate Mary, who was afterwards butchered by her cousin Elizabeth, then only a few days old, threw the kingdom into a state of confusion, and it became the prey of fanatical enthusiasm and faction. Such was the state of Scotland when the event took place of which we are treating. The manner in which the cardinal was put to death we shall give

from the *Book of Martyrs*. It says, "In the mean time, Norman Lesley, eldest son of the earl of Rothes, who had been treated by the cardinal with injustice and contempt, formed a *design*, in conjunction with his uncle, John Lesley, who *hated* Beaton, and others who *were inflamed against him* on account of his persecution of the Protestants, the death of Wishart, and other causes, to *assassinate* the prelate, though he now resided in the castle of St. Andrew's, which he was fortifying at great expense, and had, in the opinion of that age, already rendered it almost impregnable. The cardinal's retinue was numerous, the town was at his devotion, and the neighbouring country full of his dependents. However, the conspirators, who were in number only sixteen, having concerted their plan, met together early in the morning, on Saturday, the 29th of May. The first thing they did was to seize the porter of the castle, from whom they took the keys and secured the gate. They then sent four of their party to watch the cardinal's chamber, that he might have no notice given him of what was doing; after which they went and called up the servants and attendants, to whom they were well known, and turned them out of the gate, to the number of fifty, as they did also upwards of an hundred workmen, who were employed in the fortifications and buildings of the castle; but the eldest son of the regent, (whom the cardinal kept with him, under pretence of superintending his education, but, in reality, as an hostage,) they kept for their own security.

"All this was done with so little noise that the cardinal was not waked till they knocked at his chamber door; upon which he cried out, 'Who is there?' John Lesley answered, 'My name is Lesley.' 'Which Lesley?' inquired the cardinal; 'is it Norman?' It was answered, that he must open the door to those who were there; but, instead of this, he barricadoed it in the best manner he could. However, finding that they had brought fire in order to force their way, and they having, as it is said by some, made him a promise of his life, he opened the door. They immediately entered with their

swords drawn, and John Lesley smote him twice or thrice, as did also Peter Carmichael; but James Melvil (as Mr. Knox relates the affair) perceiving them to be in choler, said, ‘This work and *judgment of God*, although it be secret, ought to be done with greater gravity:’ and presenting the point of his sword to the cardinal, said to him, ‘Repent thee of thy wicked life, but especially of the shedding of the blood of that notable instrument of God, Mr. George Wishart, which albeit the flame of fire consumed before men, yet cries it for vengeance upon thee; and we from God are sent to revenge it. For here, before my God, I protest, that neither the hatred of thy person, the love of thy riches, nor the fear of any trouble thou couldst have done to me in particular, moved or moveth me to strike thee; but only because thou hast been, and remainest, an obstinate enemy of Christ Jesus and his holy gospel.’ Having said this, he with his sword run the cardinal twice or thrice through the body; who only said, ‘I am a priest—fie! fie! all is gone!’ and then expired, being about fifty-two years of age.”

We have here the acknowledgment of Fox, or his modern editors, that a set of the “saints” were “*inflamed*” against the cardinal, and that another *hated* him. But how different is this disposition to that which is taught in the gospel of Christ, and which these pretended reformers professed to follow. The rule laid down in the sacred volume by our Divine Lawgiver was, that we should love our enemies, return good for evil, and pray for those that persecute us; but here, we are told, the “new lights” entered into a murderous and secret design to assassinate an individual who had rendered himself obnoxious to them by his zeal for the established order of things. We are not going to justify the burnings of cardinal Beaton, because we are not sufficiently acquainted with the history of those transactions; but this much may be said, that what he did was done under the sanction of the established laws and usages of the country, and it cannot be proved, though it may be asserted (falsely), that he was actuated by any other motive than a sense of justice towards



society, the peace of which was endangered by the wild and latitudinarian notions of the disciples of Calvin's school. The executions under the cardinal must be attributed to the turbulence of the times, and it would have been much better if the veil of oblivion had been thrown over the deeds of those ages, than to have them placed constantly before the eyes of the ignorant multitude for the express and professed purpose of exciting the same passion, namely HATRED, against the Catholics of the present day, that the bloody conspirators of the sixteenth century had imbibed against cardinal Beaton. How much more to the credit of these enlightened days would a contrary line of conduct have been; and instead of exciting *hatred* against the professors of the most ancient faith of Christendom, a desire had been evinced to see justice done to all parties, and the spirit of charity spread among dissentients on speculative doctrine. But since the Catholics have been so unceasingly and widely represented as *eruelly* inclined from the principles of their religion, it becomes the bounden duty of a press devoted to the cause of truth, to let the public see both sides of the case, in order that a fair and just conclusion may be formed of the respective merits due to the party said to be persecutors, and the party said to be persecuted. It is with this feeling we have taken up our pen, and with no other view will we continue to exercise it, than that of enabling our readers to gather from our pages that knowledge of the history of the pretended Reformation so essential for them to know.

In the primitive ages of Christianity we observe nothing of the disposition shewn by the new reformers, who pretended to discover corruptions in the then established religion of all nations. On the contrary, we find the martyrs suffering persecution for righteousness sake, and confessing their faith in Christ with courage and fortitude, but at the same time with meekness and submission to their temporal rulers. Not so, however, with the evangelical preachers of the new doctrines. They were *inflamed* with a diabolical hatred towards those whom they deemed their oppressors, and under

the cloak of the most blasphemous pretences they committed murder and rebellion. We see it admitted by Fox, or the hatred-inspiring editors, that the work of assassination was committed in cold blood, on the part of one of the assassins, who affirmed that it was a judgment of God, and consequently that they looked upon themselves as the instruments of divine vengeance, in seeking to satiate their malice. How far their judgment was correct we will leave Burnet to decide, who observes, "that scarce any of the conspirators died an ordinary death;" from which we may conclude that the vengeance of God followed them for the diabolical deed, and the blasphemous pretensions under which it was perpetrated.

There is another circumstance connected with this affair mentioned by Dr. Heylin, in his *History of the Presbyterians*, which is not generally known, and therefore deserves our notice. Speaking of the cardinal's death, this historian says, "In the relating of which *murder*, in Knox's History, a note was given us in the margent of the first edition, printed at London, in octavo, which points us to the *godly act and saying* of James Melvin, for so the author calls this *most wicked deed*. But that edition being stopped at the press by the queen's command, the history never came out perfect till the year of our Lord 1644, when the word *godly* was left out of the marginal note, for the avoiding of that horrible scandal which had been thereby given to all sober readers." Who, indeed, but must be scandalized and horrified at the conduct of men, who, setting themselves up for the reformers of corruption and the preachers of true doctrine, held out *murder, secret cold-blooded assassination*, as a **GODLY ACT**?

The death of Cardinal Beaton was the signal for the work of *deformation* in Scotland, which consequently had its rise in heartless revenge, shocking barbarity, religious mockery, and deliberate murder. The base then on which the thing called the Reformation was raised was composed of materials containing the opposite qualities to those on which the Christian religion was founded. By the latter, man was taught,

as we have before observed, to forgive an enemy, and to stifle in his heart the motions of anger; but we see the reformers, who pretended to act under the immediate impulse of the Spirit of God, and to have been commissioned by him to reform his church, transported with rage and inflamed with savage fury, breaking into the room of an old man, and there, with fiend-like malice, glutting their vengeance with the victim's blood. Nor did their fury cease with the death of their victim; for after the perpetration of the horrible deed, they exposed the mangled body of the cardinal over the walls of the castle, as a signal of their revolt against the constituted authorities of the country.

The latter and most important part of the affair has been suppressed by the modern editors, conceiving, we suppose, that but little credit would be added to their cause by a detail of the subsequent proceedings of these *godly actors* in the work of reforming Popery. We, however, have no such feelings, as we consider a full exposure of the deeds of the reforming heroes the best way to enable the reader to come to a right decision on their merits. Heylin says: "It was upon the 19th of May, 1547, that the murderers possessed themselves of that strong place, into which many flocked from all parts of the realm, both to congratulate the act and assist the actors; so that at last they cast themselves into a congregation, and chose John Rough (who afterwards suffered death in England) to be one of their preachers; John Knox, that *great incendiary* of the realm of Scotland, for another of them. And thus they stood upon their guard till the coming of one and twenty gallies and some land forces out of France, by whom the castle was besieged, and so fiercely battered, that they were forced to yield on the last of July, without obtaining any better conditions than the hope of life."—(*Hist. of Pres.* l. iv. p. 123.) How they passed their time in the castle, while in a state of open rebellion against the regent, and after they had "cast themselves into a congregation," we may learn from the account of Buchanan, a Presbyterian writer, and himself a zealous promoter of the

Reformation. He informs us, that “they made a very bad use of this respite, which this temporal accommodation procured them; and that, notwithstanding the admonitions of Knox, they spent the time in *whoredom* and *adultery*, and all the vices of idleness.”—(*Guthrie’s Hist. of Scot.* v. 397.) A precious edifying assembly to compose the first Presbyterian congregation or parish of Scotland, with John Knox at their head. It is not a little curious, too, that one of the conditions of the surrender of this pious knot of rebellious whoremongers and adulterers was, “that the government should procure unto them a sufficient absolution from the pope; and that themselves should give pledges for surrendering the castle, how soon the absolution was brought from Rome, and delivered unto them.”—(*Ibid.* 306.) Thus these reforming saints could add hypocrisy to the list of their other crimes; but it is no wonder, for villains of a deeper dye never disgraced human nature than those who broached and carried on the Reformation, as it is called, of Scotland. They may be equalled in this work of iniquity, but they never can be excelled.

#### PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND.

After recounting the execution of two other of the reformers, named Wallace and Mille, the modern editors conclude their account of the persecution in these words:—“The death of Walter Mille proved the overthrow of Popery in Scotland. The clergy were so sensible that their affairs were falling into decay, that they, from that time, never dared to proceed to a capital punishment, on account of religion: insomuch, that in the synod held in Edinburgh, in July, this year, 1558, some persons who had been impeached of heresy, were only condemned, upon their non appearance, to make a public recantation at the market-cross of that city, on the 1st of September following, being St. Giles’s day, the titular bishop of that place. It was usual, at the feast of this saint, which now nearly approached, to carry his image in procession through the town, and the queen-regent was to honour the

solemnity with her presence ; but when the time was come, the image was missing, it having been stolen from its station by some who were too wise to pray to it. This caused a halt to be made, till another image was borrowed from the Greyfriars, with which they set forward : and after the queen had accompanied them a considerable way, she withdrew into the castle, where she was to dine. But no sooner was she gone, than some persons, who had been *purposely* appointed, tore the picture from off the shoulders of those who carried it, threw it into the dirt, and totally destroyed it. This gave such universal satisfaction to the people, that a general shout ensued, and *a riot continued in the streets during some hours* ; which was at length suppressed by the vigilance of the magistrates.

“ About the same time a great disturbance happened at Perth, the circumstances attending which were as follow : a celebrated reformist minister having preached to a numerous congregation, after sermon was over some *godly persons* remained in the church, when a priest was so *imprudent* as to *open a case*, in which was curiously engraved the *figures of many saints* : after which he made preparations for *saying mass*. A young man observing this, said aloud, ‘ This is intolerable ! As God plainly condemns, in scripture, idolatry, shall we stand and see such an insult ? ’ The priest was so offended at this, that he struck the youth a violent blow on the head, on which he broke one of the figures in the case, when immediately *all the people fell on the priest and destroyed every thing in the church that tended to idolatry*. This being soon known abroad, the people assembled in large bodies, and proceeded to the monasteries of the Grey and Black Friars, both of which they stripped ; and then pulled down the house of the Carthusians ; so that in the space of two days nothing remained of those noble buildings but the bare walls. The like kind of outrages were committed in many other towns in the kingdom.

“ At this time there were many persons who made it their business to *solicit subscriptions in order to carry on the work*



*of Reformation, and to abolish Popery.* Among these were several of the nobility, particularly the earl of Argyle, the lord James Stuart, the earl of Glencairn, &c. The endeavours of these *noble reformists* were attended with such success that they at length effected *a complete Reformation in the kingdom*; though they met with many obstacles from their *inveterate enemies the papists.*"

Taking this account to be genuine, are the transactions therein detailed creditable to the cause of reform, and that reform said to be of a *religious* nature? Did the apostles and their successors, the bishops and priests of the Catholic church, act thus when they planted Christianity in a Pagan country? Do we read of such exploits as are here unblushingly related, when Paganism was subdued and Christianity established in any part of the world through the labours of Catholic missionaries? It stands acknowledged that the Catholics were violently attacked, that sedition and outrage followed the sermon of a celebrated reformist minister, and that the work of destruction was commenced by some "GODLY persons." What an admission! Could that religion which, it is here admitted, began with the destruction of noble buildings and "the like outrages" throughout the kingdom, be grounded on the sublime principles laid down in the gospel of Christ? It is impossible. But the most curious part of the tale is that where we are told many persons made it their business to SOLICIT SUBSCRIPTIONS in order to carry on the work of Reformation, and to abolish Popery! *Solicit subscriptions*, truly! Ah, ah! had they confined themselves to *solicitations*, indeed, as the bible-mongers of the present day are forced to do, the *Reformation*, as it is miscalled, would have made as little progress under the hands of the early Scotch fanatics, as the abolition of Popery does under the modern retailers of calumny against Catholicism. We have historians, however, of greater credit than our hatred-exciting editors, who give a very different colour to the transactions above quoted. The *solicitations* are represented by them to have been *menacing demands*, and the *subscriptions* no

other than *forcible confiscations*. The "noble reformists" were not endued with the gift of persuasion, nor were they armed with the shield of truth; they therefore combined to employ brute force to aid the mad preachings of Knox and his associates, by which they plunged their country into a state of anarchy and desolation, which, after years of blood and misery, ended in the establishment of Presbyterianism, but not in the total destruction of Catholicism. Its seed was never extinct, and at this day it is flourishing in that part of the island as well as in this.

After the perpetration of the above outrages, Dr. Heylin says, the constituted authorities used much diligence to find out the principal actors, but "the brethren kept themselves together in such companies, *singing psalms*, and *openly encouraging one another*, that no one durst lay hands upon them." A very pious way, the reader will say, to preach the gospel of Christ and true religion. It may be necessary here to observe, that these rebellious proceedings were the offspring of a connection with John Calvin and the Genevian consistorians, who were in open rebellion against their prince, and had excited a rebellion in the kingdom of France; and the first fruit of them was a common band or covenant, signed by the earls of Argyle, Glencairn, and Morton, &c., in the name of themselves, their vassals, tenants, and defendants, the tenure of which was to venture their lives to establish what they called "the most blessed word of God and his congregation." This beginning made, the work of confusion soon followed. We have seen the account from Fox of the outrages committed at Perth, but his story is not altogether correct. He attributes the commencement of the riot to the imprudence of a priest in attempting to say mass, and opening a curious case engraved with images, one of which he breaks about the head of a young man. This is mere fiction, introduced to screen the unprovoked assault, by casting the blame on the suffering party. Dr. Heylin gives the following account of this affair:—After stating that Knox arrived at Perth on the 5th of May, 1559, he goes on: "In

the chief church whereof, he preached such a thundering sermon against the *adoration of images*, and the advancing of them in places of God's public worship, as suddenly beat down all the images and religious houses within the precincts of that town. For presently after the end of the sermon, when almost all the rest of the people were gone home to dinner, some few which remained in the church pulled down a glorious tabernacle which stood on the altar, broke it in pieces, and defaced the images which they found therein. Which being dispatched, they did the like execution on all the rest in that church; and were so nimble at their work, that they had made a clear riddance of them, before the tenth man in the town was advertised of it. The news hereof causeth the rascal multitude [so my author calls them] to resort in great numbers to the church." He concludes by describing the destruction of the monasteries in nearly similar words as Fox. The doctor then informs us, that Knox left Perth in company with Argyle, &c., on his way to St. Andrew's, and that preaching at a town called Craile, his "exhortation so prevailed upon most of the hearers, that immediately they betook themselves to the pulling down of altars and images; and finally, destroyed all monuments of superstition and idolatry which they found in the town." The like proceedings took place at a place called Anstruther, from whence they marched to St. Andrew's, "in the parish church whereof," continues the historian, "Knox preached upon our Saviour's casting the buyers and sellers out of the temple, and with his wonted rhetoric so inflamed the people, that they committed the like outrages there, as before at Perth, destroying images, and pulling down the houses of the Black and Grey friars, with the like dispatch." This last outrage took place on the 11th of June, so that the evangelists made quick work from the first preaching of Knox. The next scene of dilapidation was the monastery of Scone, long famous for being the place where the kings of Scotland were crowned; the churches and monasteries of Stirling and Linlithgow were next sacked and destroyed; and Edinburgh

shared the same fate. Dr. Heylin says, the queen retired from the latter place to Dunbar in great fear, and the lord Seaton, then provost of the town, staid not long behind her. "But," he continues, "he was scarce gone out of the city, when the rascal rabble fell on the religious houses, destroyed the convents of the Black and Grey friars, with all the other monasteries about the town, and shared amongst them all the goods which they found in those houses; in which they made such quick dispatch, that they had finished that part of the Reformation, before the two lords and their attendants could come in to help them."

Such were the beginnings in Scotland of that change in religion which is called the Reformation. Our blessed Saviour, when he established his church, laid down fixed rules for his ministers to follow; and when he was tempted by his enemies with regard to his loyalty and allegiance to the Roman emperor, who then reigned in Judea, his answer was: "*Render unto Cæsar the things that belong to Cæsar; and to God the things that belong to God.*" In every case, as we have before remarked, the apostles and their successors, on planting the Catholic faith in a Pagan soil, invariably followed this maxim. The religion they preached was to fit them for another world, by making them better members of this. The kingdom they came to establish was not of this world, but a supernatural one, of which Christ was the head, and the pope his visible vicegerent on earth. Hence in every kingdom of the globe which received the light of faith, monarchs, legislators, and people, alike acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the pope, while, at the same time, they were equally as tenacious of their own temporal rights and independence, nay, more so than when they were heathens. At least, such was the conduct of our English forefathers; and who has not heard of those Scottish heroes, Bruce and Wallace, who were both stanch Catholics? When the pretended reformers and disciples of evangelical liberty began to dogmatize, however, they preached up destruction and fury to the Catholic constituted authorities, which they

cloaked under the hypocritical cant of rooting out idolatry and superstition, which cry is now set up by the bible and school-mongers of the evangelical caste of the present day. Forgetful of the commands of God, to go and *teach* all nations; or rather, sensible that they had no claim to such divine commission, instead of persuasion and the power of miracles they had recourse to physical force, and the engines of death and destruction. We see them here in open rebellion against their sovereign, carrying the work of desolation and pillage in their train, and fired with the most intolerant passions against everything that savoured of Catholicism. Dr. Heylin tells us, that at the outset of the violent proceedings of Knox and his party, the queen-regent issued a proclamation, in which she declared that her wish was to satisfy every man's conscience, and therefore she would call a parliament for establishing order. That, in the mean time, every man should be suffered to live at liberty, using their own consciences without trouble, until further orders. She also charged the congregation with seeking more for the subversion of the crown than the benefit of religion. This proclamation was answered by the congregationalists, in which they denied any other intention than to banish idolatry (*i. e.* Catholicism), to advance true religion, and *defend* the *preachers* thereof; that they were ready to continue in all duty toward their sovereign, *provided* they might have the free exercise of their religion. Here, then, we see the allegiance of these Protestant reformers made *conditional*, while the allegiance of the Catholic, under all circumstances, is *unconditional*, according to the laws and principles of the constitution under which they live. As to their love of liberty of conscience, about which so much noise has been made and clamour raised against the Catholic church, the reforming or rebel party soon gave an example of what was to be expected from the liberality of their principles. Dr. Heylin says, that they wrote letters to the queen-regent herself, "whom they assured, in the close, that if she would make use of her authority for the abolishing of idolatry and super-



stitious abuses which agreed not with the word of God, she should find them as obedient as any subjects within the realm. Which, in plain truth, was neither more nor less than this,—that if they might not have their wills in the point of religion, she was to look for no obedience from them in other matters; whereof they gave sufficient proof by their staying in Edinburgh, her command to the contrary notwithstanding; by pressing more than ever for a toleration, and adding this over and above to their former demands, that such French forces as remained in Scotland might be disbanded and sent back to their native country. In the first of which demands they were so unreasonable, that when the queen offered them the exercise of their own religion, upon condition that when she had occasion to make use of any of their churches for her own devotions, such exercise might be suspended, and the mass only used in that conjuncture, they would by no means yield unto it; and they refused to yield unto it for this reason only, because it would be in her power, by removing from one place to another, to leave them without any certain exercise of their religion, which in effect was utterly to overthrow it. And hereto they were pleased to add, that, as they could not hinder her from exercising any religion which she had a mind to (but this was more than they would stand to in their better fortunes), so could they not agree that the ministers of Christ should be silenced upon any occasion, and much less, that the true worship of God should give place to idolatry. A point to which they stood so stiffly, that when the queen-regent had resettled her court at Edinburgh, she could neither prevail so far upon the magistrates of that city, as either to let her have the church of St. Giles to be appropriated only to the use of the mass, or that the mass might be said in it at such vacant times in which they made no use of it for themselves or their ministers." Thus it will be seen that on the very outset of the pretended liberty-loving Reformation, the most intolerant system of *persecution* was commenced against the professors of the ancient faith of Christendom.

These proceedings of the "noble reformists" and evangelical tribe were succeeded by other treasonable outrages. The lords of the congregation excited the whole kingdom, by a written instrument, to rise in arms, and now the country was distracted with a civil war carried on by religious fanaticism on one hand, and a struggle to preserve lawful authority on the other. One of the most successful engines used by Protestants against the Catholics of this kingdom has been the supposed authority of the pope TO DEPOSE KINGS. Of the two hundred and odd bishops that have filled the chair of St. Peter, not half a dozen ever laid claim to this power, and then not by the divine authority of the church, which could not communicate such power to any of them, but by the circumstances in which Christendom was then placed, the monarchs looking upon the pope as the common father of the faithful, and often appealing to him to settle their differences; and it may be here observed, that in no instance did the popes attempt to avail themselves of this power but in cases where the monarchs were the most immoral and tyrannical of their class, hated by the nobles and detested by the people. But not one of these obnoxious rulers lost his throne through the interference of any of the popes, though many Catholic sovereigns have felt the weight of the deposing power introduced by the very men who raised the cry against the pope. As an instance, we must here mention what took place at the period when the sham Reformation was set on foot in Scotland. We have noticed the excitement to rebellion by the lords of the congregation; this was followed by a resolution, Dr. Heylin says, to put in execution what had been long in deliberation, that is to say, THE DEPOSING OF THE QUEEN-REGENT FROM THE PUBLIC GOVERNMENT. "But first," writes the doctor, "*they must consult their ghostly fathers, that by their countenance and authority, they might more certainly prevail upon all such persons as seemed unsatisfied in the point. Willock and Knox are chosen above all the rest to resolve this doubt, if, at the least, any of them doubted of it, which may well be questioned.*"

They were both factors for Geneva, and therefore both obliged to advance her interest. Willock declares that, albeit God had appointed magistrates only to be his lieutenants on earth, honouring them with his own title, and calling them gods ; yet did he never so establish any, but that for just causes *they might be deprived*. Which having proved by *some examples out of holy scripture*, he thereupon inferred, that since the queen-regent had denied her chief duty to the subjects of this realm, which was to preserve them from invasion of strangers, and to suffer the word of God to be freely preached ; seeing also she was a *maintainer of superstition*, and despised the counsel of the nobility ; he did think *they might justly deprive her from all regiment and authority over them*. Knox goes to work more cautiously, but comes home at last ; for having first approved whatsoever had been said by Willock, he adds this to it, that the iniquity of the queen-regent ought not to withdraw their hearts from the obedience due to their sovereign ; nor did he wish that any such sentence against her should be pronounced, but that when she should change her course, and submit herself to good counsels, there should be place left unto her to regress to the same honours from which, for just cause, she ought to be deprived." Such were the opinions of the apostles of the Reformation in Scotland, so lauded by the modern editors of the *Book of Martyrs* ; but we should be glad to learn whether they dare to avow, at this day, the correctness of these opinions on which the blessed Reformation was founded. If they did, we think they would soon have the attorney-general teaching them to change their opinions.

Having shewn the pernicious tendency of the civil doctrines, we must now give the reader some idea of the stability they attached to their articles of faith. Hitherto no particular creed had been followed, but on the death of Mary of England, and the accession of Elizabeth, finding it necessary to secure the interests of the latter queen, the liturgy of the English church established by Elizabeth was the form of worship adopted by the Scotch rebel reformers, by solemn

subscription. But when the king of France, Francis II., who was the husband of the unfortunate Mary, died, and the reformers were no longer in fear of the French, they then began to discover their affections for the Genevian discipline and creed, and their distaste to the form which they before solemnly subscribed to. Dr. Heylin tells us that "Knox had before devised a new Book of Discipline, contrived, for the most part, after Calvin's platform, and a new form of Common-prayer was digested also, more consonant to his infallible judgment than the English liturgy. But hitherto they had both lain dormant, because they stood in need of such help from England, as could not be presumed on with so great a confidence, if they had openly declared any dissent or disaffection to the public forms which were established in that church. Now their estate is so much bettered by the death of the king, the sad condition of their queen, and the assurances which they had from the court of England (from whence the earls of Morton and Glencairn were returned with comfort), that they resolve to perfect what they had begun: to prosecute the desolation of religious houses, and the spoil of churches; to introduce their new forms, and suspend the old. For compassing of which end they summoned a convention of the estates to be held in January.

"Now in this book of discipline," continues the doctor, "they take upon them to *innovate in most things formerly observed and practised in the church of Christ*, and in *some things which themselves had settled*, as the *groundwork* of the Reformation. They take upon them to discharge the accustomed fasts, and abrogate all the ancient festivals, not sparing those which did relate particularly unto Christ our Saviour, as his nativity, passion, resurrection, &c. They condemn the use of the cross in baptism, give way to the introduction of the new order of Geneva for ministering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and commend sitting for the most proper and convenient gesture to be used at it. They require that all churches not being parochial should be forthwith *demolished*, declare all forms of God's public wor-

ship, which are not prescribed in his word, to be mere idolatry, and that none ought to administer the holy sacraments but such as are qualified for preaching. They appoint the catechism of Geneva to be taught in their schools, ordained three universities to be made and continued in that kingdom, with salaries proportioned to the professors in all arts and sciences, and time assigned for being graduated in the same. They decree also in the same, that tithes should be no longer paid to the Romish clergy, but that they shall be taken up by deacons and treasurers, by them to be employed for maintenance of the poor, the ministers, and the said universities. They complained very sensibly of the tyranny of lay-patrons and impropriators in exacting their tithes, in which they are said to be more cruel and unmerciful than the popish priests; and therefore take upon them to determine, as in point of law, what commodities shall be tithable, what not; and declare also that all leases and alienations which formerly had been made of tithes, should be utterly void." Then followed some regulations touching the ministry of the sacrament and preaching, by which it was ordered that the ministers should be ELECTED by the congregation. The reader will here contrast the discipline set forth in this book, with the mode practised by the primitive Christians, and followed by every nation that received the faith of Christ. Dr. Heylin says that they began with INNOVATION, and even *changed* that which they before considered the *groundwork* of their Reformation. Under these circumstances it is impossible that the proceedings of these rebel reformers could be guided by the influence of truth, because truth is always *one* and *the same*, and will not bear *innovation* or *change*. The work, then, of these "noble reformists," as they are stiled by the modern editors, must have been instigated by the powers of darkness, under which it is clear they acted.

It is said by our divine Saviour, that the goodness of the tree shall be known by its fruit, and common sense tells us it is only by following this rule that we can come to a right



conclusion on the respective merits of the Reformation, so called, and the principal actors therein. We have seen them changing their creed as birds do their feathers, but they clung with more pertinacity to the work of destruction. They solicited of the convention of estates, in the absence of the queen, for leave to demolish all the monuments of *superstition* and *idolatry*, by which they meant all cathedral churches, as well as monasteries and other religious houses, and before they could have the assent or dissent of the queen or her council, they proceeded to execute ecclesiastical censures, and arrogate to themselves the authority of nominating their own ministers over the heads of the old incumbents, and to hold their general assemblies. Emboldened by these unjustifiable acts, for they were neither authorized by law, confirmed by the queen, nor sanctioned by the convention of estates, a petition is directed to the lords of the secret council from the *assemblies of the church*, in which their lordships are solicited to make quick work of it. "On the receipt of this petition," writes Dr. Heylin, "an order presently is made by the lords of the council, for granting all which was desired; and had more been desired, they had granted more, so formidable were the brethren grown to the opposite party. Nor was it granted in words only which took no effect, but execution caused to be done upon it; and warrants to that purpose issued to the earls of Arran, Argyle, and Glencairn, the lord James Stuart, &c. Whereupon followed a *pitiful devastation of churches and church-buildings in all parts of the realm*; no difference made, but all religious edifices of what sort soever, were either terribly defaced, or utterly ruined; the holy vessels, and whatsoever else could be turned into money, as lead, bells, timber, glass, &c., were publicly exposed to sale; *the very sepulchres of the dead not spared*; the registers of the church, and *the libraries thereunto belonging, defaced and thrown into the fire*. Whatsoever had escaped the former tumults, is now made subject to destruction; so much the worse, because the violence and sacrilegious actings of these church-robbers had

now the countenance of law. And to this work of spoil and rapine, men of *all ranks and orders* were observed to put their helping hands; men of most note and quality being forward in it, *in hope of getting to themselves the most part of the booty*; those of the poorer sort, in hope of being gratified for their pains therein by their lords and patrons. Both sorts encouraged to it by the zealous madness of some of their seditious preachers, who frequently cried out, that the places where idols had been worshipped, ought by the law of God, to be destroyed; that the sparing of them was the reserving of things execrable; and that the commandment given to Israel for destroying the places where the Canaanites did worship their false gods, *was a just warrant to the people for doing the like*. By which encouragements the madness of the people was transported beyond the bounds which they had first prescribed unto it. In the beginning of the heats, they designed only the destruction of religious houses, for fear the monks and friars might otherwise be restored in time to their former dwellings; but they proceeded to the demolishing of cathedral churches, and ended in the ruin of parochial also; the chancels whereof were sure to be levelled in all places, though the aisles and bodies of them might be spared in some."

Such was the deplorable effect of the Reformation, as it is called, in Scotland; an effect much more destructive and disastrous to learning and the sciences than the devastating rapacity of the reformers in England, who, by adhering to the order of episcopacy, preserved in some degree the beautiful cathedrals which adorned the kingdom, many of which are standing now, a sad testimony of the superiority of the "dark ages" of monkery and Catholicism, over the *enlightened* days of bible reading and sectarianism. The conduct of the unfortunate Mary in these days of tribulation and adversity was that of a just and amiable sovereign, desirous of allaying the spirit of innovation by mild and gentle means, and granting the utmost liberty of conscience to those who had imbibed the noxious doctrines of Calvin and Knox. But

these Christian feelings did not satisfy the boisterous reformers, who openly railed at the stipends proposed to be granted to their ministers, and exclaimed at the Catholic clergy being paid and encouraged in their idolatrous practices. John Knox, with daring impudence, raved in the pulpit against his sovereign, a beautiful and defenceless woman, and even insulted her to her face at a conference she granted him. The modern editors of *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, we have no doubt, are all loyal men to the backbone, and would consent freely to the punishment of any of those individuals who lately sought a redress of the abuse known to exist in the civil administration of the country. They make a great noise about the tyranny of the Catholic church, and the cruelties of the inquisition; and they have lauded to the highest heavens the conduct of the authors of the Reformation, so called, in England and in Scotland; but they have most carefully concealed the blood-thirsty tyranny, the diabolical robberies and murders, the barbarous outrages, and the despotic temper of the miscreants who figured in that affair. It is but right however that the people should be informed of the proceedings which marked that epoch. We are, therefore, rejoiced that our loyal modern editors have imposed the task upon us; but that we may not be charged with dealing in assertions, without advancing proofs, we will here give the words of Dr. Heylin, from his "History of the Presbyterians," from which we have before quoted. Thus writes this author:—"At Midsummer they held a general assembly, and there agreed upon the form of a petition to be presented to the queen in the name of the kirk; the substance of it was for abolishing the mass, and other superstitious rites of the Romish religion; for inflicting some punishment against blasphemy, adultery, contempt of word, the profanation of sacraments, and other like vices condemned by the word of God, whereof the laws of the realm did not take any hold; for referring all actions of divorce to the church's judgment, or at the least to men of good knowledge and conversation; for excluding all popish churchmen from holding any place in council or session; and

finally, for the increase and more assured payment of the minister's stipends, but more particularly for appropriating the glebes and houses unto them *alone*. This was the sum of their desires, but couched in *such irreverent, coarse, and bitter expressions*, and those expressions justified with such animosities, that Lethington (the secretary of state) had much ado to prevail upon them for putting it into a more dutiful and civil language. All which the queen knew well enough, and therefore would afford them no better answer, but that she would do nothing to the prejudice of that religion which she then professed; and that she hoped to have mass restored, before the end of the year, in all parts of the kingdom. Which being so said, or so reported, gave Knox occasion in his preachings before the gentry of Kyle and Galloway (to which he was commissioned by the said assembly) to forewarn some of them of the dangers which would shortly follow; and thereupon earnestly to exhort them to take such order that they might be obedient to authority, and yet not suffer the enemies of God's truth to have the upper hand. And they, who understood his meaning at half a word, assembled themselves together on the 4th of Sept., at the town of Ayr, where they entered into a common bond, subscribed by the earl of Glencairn, the lords Boyd and Uchiltry, with one hundred and thirty more of note and quality, besides the provost and burgesses of the town of Ayr, which made forty more. The tenor of which bond was this that followeth:—

“ We whose names are underwritten, do promise in the presence of God, and in the presence of his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that we and every one of us, shall and will maintain the preaching of his holy evangel, now of his mercy offered and granted to this realm; and also will maintain the ministers of the same against all persons, power and authority, that will oppose themselves to the doctrine proposed, and by us received. And farther, with the same solemnity we protest and promise that every one of us shall assist

another, yea, and the whole body of the Protestants within this realm, in all lawful and just occasions, against all persons; so that whosoever shall hurt, molest, or trouble any of our bodies, shall be reputed enemies to the whole, except that the offender will be content to submit himself to the government of the church now established amongst us. And this we do, as we desire to be accepted and favoured of the Lord Jesus, and accepted worthy of credit and honesty in the presence of the godly.'

“And in pursuance of this bond, they seize upon some priests, and give notice to others, that they would not trouble themselves of complaining to the queen or council, but would execute the punishment appointed to idolaters in the law of God, as they saw occasion whensoever they should be apprehended. At which the queen was much offended; but there was no remedy. All she could do, was once again to send for Knox, and to desire him so to deal with the barons and other gentlemen of the west, that they would not punish any man for the cause of religion, as they had resolved. To which he answered with as little reverence as at other times, that if her majesty would punish malefactors according to the laws, he durst assure her, that she should find peace and quietness at the hand of those who professed the Lord Jesus in that kingdom: that if she thought or had purposed to allude the laws, there were some who would not fail to let the Papists understand, that they should *not be suffered without punishment* to offend their God. Which said, he went about to prove in a long discourse, that *others* were by God intrusted with *the sword of justice*, besides kings and princes; which kings and princes, if they *failed in the right use of it*, and drew it not against offenders, they *must not look to find obedience from the rest of the subjects*.

“The same man (Knox) preaching afterwards at one of their general assemblies, made a distinction between the ordinance of God, and the persons placed by him in authority;



and then affirmed that men might lawfully and justly resist the persons, and not offend against the ordinance of God. He added as a corollary unto his discourse, that subjects were not bound to obey their princes, if they command unlawful things; but that they might resist their princes, and that they were not bound to suffer. For which being questioned by secretary Lethington in the one, and desired to declare himself further in the other point, he justified himself in both, affirming that he had long been of that opinion, and did so remain. A question hereupon arising about the punishment of kings, if they were idolaters, it was honestly affirmed by Lethington, that there was no commandment given in that case to punish kings, and that the people had no power to be judges over them, but must leave them unto God alone, who would either punish them by death, imprisonment, war, or some other plagues. Against which Knox replied with his wonted confidence, that to affirm that the people, or a part of the people may not execute God's judgments against their king, being an offender, the lord Lethington could have no other warrant, except his own imaginations, and the opinion of such as rather feared to displease their princes than offend their God. Against which, when Lethington objected the authority of some eminent Protestants, Knox answered, that they spake of Christians subject to tyrants and infidels, so dispersed, that they had no force but only to cry unto God for their deliverance: that such indeed should hazard any further than those godly men willed them, he would not hastily be of counsel. But that his argument had another ground, and that he spake of a people assembled in one body of a commonwealth, unto whom God had given *sufficient force*, not only to *resist*, but also to *suppress* all kind of open idolatry; and such a people again he affirmed were bound to keep their land clean and unpolluted: that God required one thing of Abraham and his seed, when he and they were strangers in the land of Egypt, and that another thing was required of them when they were delivered from that bondage, and put into the actual possession of the land of Canaan."

We shall cite no further to shew the diabolical and dangerous doctrines introduced by the reformers into their new system of religion, or more properly speaking, irreligion. It is here clearly proved that they were instigated, not by the principles of charity and truth, but by the basest of passions, and hurried on by the spirit of intolerance, cruelty, and slaughter. The doctrines advocated by Knox were of the most revolutionary tendency, and grounded upon treachery and hypocrisy. We have here the very doctrines charged upon the Catholics by their Protestant adversaries, which the former disclaim and deny as forming any part of their civil and religious principles. How disgraceful, how dishonourable, how unjust then is that conduct, which attempts to fasten upon a class of men crimes of the most abhorrent nature, which they never practised but always condemned; while these very enormities were inculcated and acted upon by another set of men, who are represented as the most perfect set of beings by the accusers of the innocent!

But it is high time that we should have the testimony of credible and unprejudiced witnesses to the character of the leaders of the Scotch Reformation. Of John Knox, Dr. Stuart, in his "History of Scotland," writes thus:—"The glory of God stimulated this reformer to cruel devastations and outrages. Charity, moderation, the love of peace, patience, and humility, were not in the number of his virtues. Papists as well as Popery were the objects of his detestation; and though he had risen to eminence *by exclaiming against the persecution of priests, he was himself a PERSECUTOR*. His suspicions, that the queen was determined to re-establish the popish religion, were rooted and uniform; and upon the *most frivolous pretences*, he was strenuous to break that chain of cordiality which ought to bind together the prince and the people. He inveighed against her government, and insulted her person with virulence and indecency. *It flattered his pride to violate the duties of the subject, and to scatter sedition*. His advices were pressed with heat, his admonitions were pronounced with anger; and whether his theme

was a topic of polity or of faith, his knowledge appeared to be equally infallible. He wished to be considered *as the organ of the Divine will*. Contradiction inflamed him with hostility, and his resentments took a deep and lasting foundation. The pride of success, the spirit of adulation, the awe with which he struck the gaping and ignorant multitude, inspired him with a superlative conception of his own merits. He mistook for prophetic impulse the illusions of a heated fancy, and with *an intemperate and giddy vanity*, he ventured at times *to penetrate into the future*, and to reveal *the mysteries of providence*."—(Vol. ii. p. 135.)

Such were the qualities possessed by Knox, and we ask the sensible reader, of whatever religious denomination he may be, whether such a character as we have here described would be chosen by the Divinity to work a Reformation in the morals of the people, or establish a new system of faith, supposing the words of Christ to have failed, when he promised that the Spirit of Truth should abide with his church, and guide her in all truth to the end of the world? Knox is here charged with being a PERSECUTOR, while he was exclaiming against the persecution of priests; and we charge the modern editors of Fox with the same hypocritical and unjust line of conduct; for they, while endeavouring to raise the cry of persecution against the Catholics of the present day, are hostilely combined to persecute the accused, by debarring them from the exercise of their civil rights, for no other cause than following the dictates of conscience.

The next hero in the Scottish drama is George Buchanan, who was a man of undoubted literary talents, but of the most abandoned character. Dr. Stuart says of him: "While his genius and ability adorned the times in which he lived, and must draw to him the admiration of the most distant posterity; it is not to be forgotten, that his political conduct was disgraceful to the greatest degree, and must excite its regrets and provoke its indignation. His zeal for the earl of Murray overturned altogether his allegiance as a subject, and his integrity as a man. His activity against Mary, in

the conferences in England, was a strain of the most shameless corruption; and the virulence with which he endeavoured to defame her by his writings, was most audacious and criminal. They involve the complicated charge of ingratitude, rebellion, and perjury.”—(*Hist. of Scot.* v. ii. p. 245.) This miscreant, by his writings, contributed much to the poisoning of the public mind, and inflaming the bad passions of the people against the old order of things. He wrote a work entitled, *The Detection of Mary's Doings*, in which, Dr. Stuart observes, “in the place of information and truth, he substitutes a boundless audacity of assertion, and the most pestilent rancour. An admirable but malicious eloquence, misrepresentations, and the vileness of calumny, characterize his work; and it remains an illustrious monument of the wickedness of faction, and the prostitution of wit.”—(*Ibid.* p. 415.) The Rev. Mr. Whitaker, another Protestant author, in his *Vindication of Mary*, says, Knox was “an original genius in lying,” and he further writes, that “he [Knox] felt his mind impregnated with a peculiar portion of that spirit of falsehood, which is so largely possessed by the great father of lies, and which he so liberally communicates to some of his chosen children. And he exerted this spirit with the grand views, which he uniformly pursued in, both that of abusing Mary, his patroness and benefactress; of branding her forehead with the hottest iron of infamy, which his understanding could provide; and of breaking down all the fences and guards of truth, in the eagerness of his knavery against her. But Mary herself has told us a circumstance concerning him, that serves sufficiently to account for his flagitious conduct. Buchanan, she said, *is known to be a lewd man, and an Atheist*. He was one of those wretched men, therefore, who suffer their passions to beguile their understandings; who plunge into scepticism to escape from sensibility; who destroy the tone of their minds, while they are blunting the force of their feelings; and at last become devoid equally of principle and of shame, ready for any fabrication of falsehood, and capable of any operation in villainy.”—(v. ii. p. 22.)

To these principal leaders in the work of devastation in Scotland we must add the lord James Stuart, afterwards earl of Murray, and regent of the kingdom, who, like the other actors, was an apostate from the church of Rome. In fact, he was originally an ecclesiastic under the name of the prior of St. Andrew's; "but," says Mr. Whitaker, "when the Reformation broke out in all its wildness and strength, he put on the sanctified air of a reformer, he wrapped himself up in the long cloak of puritanism, he attached all the popular leaders among the (reformed) clergy to him, and he prepared to make them his useful steps to the throne."—(*Vind.* vol. i. p. 22.) The reader must here be told that this ambitious hypocrite was an illegitimate son of king James V., the father of the unfortunate Mary, from which circumstance he conceived the criminal project of dethroning his unprotected sister Mary, and taking the sceptre into his own hands. To advance his aspiring object, Mr. Whitaker continues,— "He had the address to make the most cunning and most ambitious of his contemporaries to be subservient to his cunning; to make them commit the enormities themselves which were necessary to his purposes; and even to dip their hands in murder, that he might enjoy the sovereignty. But he displayed an address still greater than this. Though he had not one principle of religion within him, though he had not one grain of honour in his soul, and though he was guilty of those more monstrous crimes, against which God has peculiarly denounced damnation; yet he was denominated A GOOD MAN by the reformers at the time, and he has been considered as an honest man, by numbers, to our own days."—(*Ibid.* p. 24.) The colours in which Dr. Stuart has drawn his picture are not more favourable:—"A selfish and insatiable ambition was his ruling appetite, and he pursued its dictates with an unshaken perseverance. His inclination to aspire beyond the rank of a subject, was encouraged by the turbulence of his age; and his connections with Elizabeth overturned in him altogether the virtuous restraints of allegiance and duty. He became an enemy to his sister, and



his sovereign—his obligations to her were excessive ; his ingratitude was monstrous ; and no language has any terms of reproach, that are sufficiently powerful to characterize his perfidiousness and cruelty to her. Uncommon pretensions to sanctity, and to the love of his country, with the perpetual affectation of acting under the impulse of honourable motives, concealed his purposes, and recommended him to popular favour. His manners were grave even to sadness ; by a composed and severe deportment, and by ostentatious habits of devotion, he awakened and secured the admiration of his contemporaries. His house had a greater resemblance to a church than a palace. A dark solemnity reigned within its walls ; and his domestics were precise, pragmatical, and mortified. The more zealous of the clergy were proud of resorting to him, and while he invited them to join with him in the exercises of religion, he paid a flattering respect to their expositions of scripture, which he hypocritically considered as the sacred rule of his life. To the interests of science and learning he was favourable in an uncommon degree ; and Buchanan, who has tasted his bounty, gives a varnish to his crimes. The glory of having achieved the Reformation afforded him a fame that was most seducing and brilliant. With a cold and perfidious heart, he conferred favours without being generous, and received them without being grateful. His enmity was implacable, his friendship dangerous, and his caresses, oftener than his anger, preceded the stroke of his resentment. The standard of his private interest directed all his actions, and was the measure by which he judged of those of other men. To the necessities of his ambition he was ready to sacrifice every duty and every virtue, and in the paroxysms of his selfishness he feared not the commission of any crime or cruelty, however enormous or detestable. To the great body of the Scottish nobles, whose consequence he had humbled, his death was a matter of stern indifference, or of secret joy ; but to the common people, it was an object of sincere grief, and they lamented him long, under the appellation of the godly regent.

Elizabeth bewailed in him a strenuous partisan, and a chosen instrument, by which she might subvert the independency of Scotland; and Mary, tender and devout, wept over a brother, a heretic, and an enemy, whom a sudden and violent destiny had overtaken in his guilty career, with his full load of unrepented crimes."—(*Hist. of Scot.* v. ii., p. 52.)

Enough has been said of the character of these "noble reformists," as they are termed by the modern editors of Fox; it now remains for us to show whether "a complete Reformation in the kingdom" was effected through their instrumentality, as the modern editors assert, or whether the endeavours of the "noble reformists" were not followed by an excess of immorality, and the most direful calamities that could afflict a nation. The testimonies we have adduced unequivocally prove that the characters of the leading reformers were made up of the unchristian dispositions of revenge, cruelty, ambition, revolt, hypocrisy, and every vice that disgraces the human heart; it is, therefore, not to be expected that the followers of such leaders were to be found immaculate and undefiled in their actions. No, no; the consequences that resulted from what is called the Reformation were the very reverse of what followed the planting of that faith and church which the reformers pretended to reform. When Catholicism was introduced by the holy missionaries sent from the pope of Rome for that purpose, the people were transformed from savage, uncultivated heathens into orderly and hospitable Christians. Learning and science were cultivated, churches and monasteries were erected, hospitals were raised to support the sick and infirm, the clergy were obliged to lead a life of celibacy and penance; while idle pensioners and placemen, living on the labour of the working classes, were unknown. Such were the fruits of the establishment of Catholicism, or Popery, as the modern editors call it; alas! how altered is the scene under the thing called the Reformation. Duplicity, violence, ferocity, murder, fanaticism, became general in Scotland; the whole nation was impregnated with vice and iniquity, and the very men

who were the cause of this general wickedness were compelled to bear witness to their own work of infamy and guilt. In the year 1578, the commissioners of the kirk conceived that they had then a favourable opportunity to advance a new discipline, which they had long contemplated. To usher in their design they passed an act of the assembly, the preamble of which set forth, that “the general assembly of the kirk finding *universal corruption* of the whole estates of the body of the realm, the great coldness and slackness in religion in the greatest part of the professors of the same, with the *daily increase* of all kind of fearful sins and enormities, as incests, adulteries, murders (committed in Edinburgh and Stirling), cursed sacrilege, ungodly sedition, and division within the bowels of the realm, with all manner of disordered and ungodly living,” they call for “such a polity and discipline in the kirk, as is craved by the word of God,” &c. But with all their endeavours to restore morality, it does not appear that they were in any manner successful, which manifestly shews that the tree was not good, since it yielded such bad fruit. In the year 1648, about seventy years after, the general assembly of divines again complained that “ignorance of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ, prevailed exceedingly in the land; that it were impossible to reckon up all the abominations that were in the land; and that the blaspheming of the name of God, swearing by the creatures, profanation of the Lord’s day, uncleanness, excess, and rioting, vanity of apparel, lying and deceit, railing and cursing, arbitrary and uncontrolled oppression, and grinding of the faces of the poor by landlords and others in place and power, *were become ordinary and common sins.*”—(*An Acknowledgment of Sins.*) Nor was the kirk in a more flourishing state in 1778 than in the former periods, for the divines of the associate synod of that year say:—“It is surprising to think what gross ignorance of the meaning and authority of the truths they profess to believe, prevails at present among many.”—(*Warning*, p. 52.) “A general unbelief of revealed religion [prevails] among the higher

orders of our countrymen, which hath by a necessary consequence, produced in vast numbers an absolute indifference as to what they believe, either concerning truth or duty, any further than it may comport with their worldly views".—(*Ibid.* p. 54.) Then, speaking of the country generally, they lament it is *now*, "through the prevalence of infidelity, ignorance, luxury and venality, so much despoiled of all religion and feeling the want of it."—(*Ibid.* p. 64.) Before we conclude our account of the transactions of the reformers of Scotland, we feel it a duty to injured innocence to give a summary view of the treatment which Mary, their beautiful, their accomplished queen, experienced at their hands. She was the daughter and only legitimate child of James V., whom she succeeded when in the cradle, having her mother for queen-regent. She was promised in marriage to Edward VI. of England, but through the power of the Hamiltons, was carried into France, where she married the dauphin, afterwards Francis II., of that kingdom. While residing in France, the pretended Reformation of Scotland commenced, and her royal husband dying, she was induced to leave that kingdom, and place herself in person on the throne of Scotland. Finding herself an unprotected woman, surrounded by nobles heated with faction and bent on rapine and spoil, she married Henry, lord Darnley, the eldest son of the earl of Lennox. This marriage gave considerable umbrage to the reformed party, and a conspiracy was entered into between the lords Morton, Murray, and Bothwell, to remove Darnley, and Bothwell was to obtain possession of the queen's person by marriage. The plot was soon put into execution, and Darnley was blown up by gunpowder whilst he lay sick in his bed; the queen was seized by Bothwell and carried to Dunbar castle. Here every art was used by Bothwell to induce the helpless and indignant Mary to consent to a union with him, but in vain, and he had recourse at last to violence by an act of ravishment. The queen wept and lamented over the degradation thus forced upon her, and judging it wiser to conceal her misfortune than that the scandal should

go forth to the world ; considering also the helplessness of her own situation, and the powerful confederacy raised against her, she at length consented to wed the cruel and haughty Bothwell. But the cup of sorrow for this ill-fated princess was not yet filled. She had been attached to the religion of her forefathers from her infancy, and neither force nor intrigue could lessen her fidelity to God. She was unalterably fixed to her religion, and this made her the devoted victim of the villany and perfidy of the " noble reformists," as the modern editors call the leaders in the diabolical concerns of Scotland. They openly accused the unhappy princess of being guilty of adultery with her ravisher ; of murdering Darnley, her husband, in order that she might indulge with her paramour ; of having concerted a plan with him for her own seizure, for her own ravishment, and for her own marriage, as if she, the queen of the realm, could not have married the man she wished, without either the seizure or the rape. But this is not all. Papers and letters were FORGED by the reforming party to convict her of these horrible and unnatural crimes, the villany of which attempt has been most ably detected and exposed by the Rev. Mr. Whitaker, in his *Vindication of Mary*. To such a diabolical pitch did they carry this system of *forgery*, that the queen was constrained to give directions that no orders should be taken with regard to the lord Huntley, whose death they attempted by a forged warrant, except from her very LIPS. Who, with the feeling of nature in his breast, but must sigh over the misfortunes of a woman and a queen, lovely, mild, courageous, and refined ; who, when looking on her portrait the day before her execution, now to be seen at the windows of almost every print-shop in the metropolis, but must loath and execrate her persecutors, who, under the cloak of religion, offered to her the grossest insults and indignities ? Nor was their revenge satiated even with her death, since they sought to tarnish her unblemished life by *forged accusations*.

Speaking of this base and cruel attempt to sully the



character of this virtuous Catholic princess, Mr. Whitaker exclaims, "FORGERY, I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write, seems to have been *peculiar to the reformed*. I look in vain for one of these accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of Popery."—(*Vind.* vol. ii., p. 2.) This author further says, "*the infamy of forgery* was not confined to Scotland at this period. It extended equally to England." Randolph, the agent of Elizabeth at the Scottish court, had recourse to the same disgraceful means of *forging* letters in the name of lord Lennox, to induce the Scottish lords to draw their swords against their sovereign, by their regard for the reformed religion. "On the detection of them," observes Mr. Whitaker, "Randolph was justly reproached with *the profligacy of his conduct*. Nothing but the peculiarity of his situation as an ambassador could have screened him from the vengeance due to it. Even Elizabeth was very naturally considered as an associate in the foul act of forgery with him. He acted, no doubt, by her directions. The peculiar boldness of his proceedings shews it. But, indeed, Elizabeth did not attempt to vindicate herself from the imputation. She never disowned either the violence or fraudulence of her ambassador. She did not even recall him. She even justified him in form upon his return, as a man of integrity, and as a friend to Scotland. And she thus made all his forgery her own. She had long been habituated to the sight of forgery. She had seen it displayed in its liveliest colours, at the conferences before her commissioners. She had made herself a party in that grand deed of knavery, by assisting in the deception, and by uniting to prosecute the purpose of it. But she afterwards went further in forgery. She rose from the humility of an accomplice to the dignity of a chief in the work. The vile arts which she had seen practised by the Scots against their queen, she practised with more confidence, and with less success against the Scots themselves. And she exercised them equally against Mary afterwards; letters forged in the name of Mary being sent to the houses of papists, letters forged in the name of papists

being pretendedly intercepted on their way to Mary, and even forged letters from Mary, concerning Babington's conspiracy, being pretended to be found in the wall of her prison. Elizabeth had probably been taught this highest act of flagitious policy by that *trio* of the most unprincipled politicians, which human impiety perhaps ever generated all together; Murray, Morton, and Lethington. By them, probably, she had been initiated into those hellish mysteries of iniquity. And Lethington, no doubt, was the original initiator of them all."... "Such, such (continues the same author) were the persons that presumed to call themselves reformers, to tax the wickedness of Popery, and to be zealous for the purity of religion! That great ferment, indeed, which was sure to be excited in the body politic of Christendom by the necessary efforts for Reformation, naturally threw out to the surface a violent eruption of morbid matter on every side. But forgery appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism. Originally coming forth as a kind of leprosy, upon the brow of Presbyterianism in Scotland, it was conveyed by the intercourses of vice, to the profligate head of the church of England."

FORGERY, then, it is here declared by a Protestant divine, was peculiar to Protestantism. Before Cranmer and Knox commenced as reformers in England and Scotland, this system of *fraud* and *villany* was *unknown* to the whole of Christendom, and the same authority that fixes it upon those who pretended to be inspired to reform religion says, that not one single act of this infamous kind can be proved against Catholics to this day. What then are we to think of the conduct of men who could be guilty of such base actions? From forging letters and documents to traduce the character of a Catholic queen and rob many eminent Catholics of their property and their lives, this work of deception has been carried on and multiplied in commercial transactions, until hundreds of Protestants within the last thirty years have ended their lives, in this Protestant country, for it at the gallows. Oh God! how inscrutable are thy designs! how

unsearchable thy ways ! But forgery was not the only means by which the "*complete Reformation*" in Scotland was brought about by the endeavours of the "*noble reformists*," as the modern editors style the actors in this work of blood and desolation. PERSECUTION, for conscience sake, was a peculiar feature in its progress. We have repeatedly said and shewn that Catholicism was established in every country that received it by the power of persuasion and conviction only. In no instance whatever was compulsion resorted to ; but in many cases it was planted in opposition to the *civil sword*, numerous martyrs having sealed their testimony of the doctrines they preached by their blood. But such was not the case with our reforming gentry ; for no sooner did they obtain possession of temporal power, than they exercised the most wanton and tyrannical authority over the consciences of men, in order to *force* all descriptions of people into a *blind* and *unlimited acceptance* of their new fangled *doctrines*, which were as variable as the wind, being changed at the caprice of those who held the reins of government. In proof that PERSECUTION was part and parcel of the Reformation in Scotland, we shall here take an extract from "*The National Covenant ; or the Confession of Faith* : subscribed at first by the king's majesty and his household, in the year 1580 ; thereafter by persons of all ranks in the year 1581," &c. ; subscribed again by all sorts of persons in the year 1590 ; approved by the general assembly, 1638 and 1639 ; subscribed again by all ranks in the latter year ; ratified by an act of parliament in 1640 ; and subscribed by king Charles II. at Spey in 1650, and Scoon in 1651. The edition we take the extract from was printed at Edinburgh in the year 1815, by Sir D. Hunter Blair and J. Bruce, printers to the king's most excellent majesty. It says, " Like as many acts of parliament, not only in general, do abrogate, annul, and rescind all laws, statutes, acts, constitutions, canons—civil or municipal—with all other ordinances, and practique penalties whatsoever, made in prejudice of true religion, and professors thereof ; or of the true kirk, discipline, jurisdiction, and free-

dom thereof; or in favours of idolatry and superstition, or of the papistical kirk: as act 3. act 31. parl. 1. act 23. parl. 11 act 114. parl. 12. of king James VI. That papistry and superstition may be utterly suppressed, according to the intention of the acts of parliament, repeated in the 5th act, parl. 20. king James VI. And to that civil and ecclesiastical pains, as adversaries to God's true religion, preached, and by law established, within this realm, act 24. parl. 11. king James VI.; as common enemies to all Christian government, act 18. parl. 16. king James VI.; as rebellers and gainstanders of our sovereign Lord's authority, act 47. parl. 3. king James VI.; and as idolaters, act 104. parl. 7. king James VI. But also in particular, by and attour the confession of faith, do abolish and condemn the pope's authority and jurisdiction out of this land, and ordains the maintainers thereof to be punished, act 2. parl. 1. act 51. parl. 3. act 106. parl. 7. act 114. parl. 12. king James VI.; do condemn the pope's erroneous doctrine, or any other erroneous doctrine repugnant to any of the articles of the true and Christian religion, publicly preached, and by law established in this realm; and ordains the spreaders and makers of books or libels, or letters, or writs of that nature to be punished, act 46. parl. 3. act 106. parl. 7. act 24. parl. 11. king James VI.; do condemn all baptism conform to the pope's kirk, and the idolatry of the mass; and ordains all sayers, wilful hearers, and concealers of the mass, the maintainers and resettlers of the priests, Jesuits, trafficking Papists, to be punished without any exception or restriction, act 5. parl. 1. act 120. parl. 12. act 164. parl. 13. act 193. parl. 14. act 1. parl. 19. act 5. parl. 20. king James VI.; do condemn all erroneous books and writs containing erroneous doctrine against the religion presently professed, or containing superstitious rites and ceremonies papistical, whereby the people are greatly abused, and ordains the home-bringers of them to be punished, act 25. parl. 11. king James VI.; do condemn the monuments and dregs of bygone idolatry, as going to crosses, observing the festival days of saints, and such other superstitious and papis-

tical rites, to the dishonour of God, contempt of true religion, and fostering of great error among the people; and ordains the users of them to be punished for the second fault, as idolaters, act 104. parl. 7. king James VI."

It is not to be wondered that with such fiend-like laws as these, under which a person had no alternative but either to subscribe to this covenant or confession of faith, or perish by the sword, that the Reformation made great progress, especially as the leaders in the work were very zealous in enforcing obedience to those laws. In the *Presbyteries' Trial*, p. 29, it is stated, that "at the beginning men only were admitted to subscribe the covenant; yea, shortly after the more zealous sisters obtained that favour; and others who were not seeking that courtesy, got it pressed upon them. At length, it came to children at school, to servants, young maids, and all sorts of persons, without exception. And those who could not write their own names into the covenant, behoved to do it by public notary; so that they would have none to be left out of God's covenant, and the covenant of grace, as they spoke." Such was the detestable tyranny of these pretended friends of evangelical liberty, whose freedom consisted in *forcing* even *children* to subscribe their covenant, who could not even read and understand what they thus subscribed, and not only were they made to *subscribe*, but likewise to *swear* that this *new* form of religion was God's undoubted truth grounded only upon his written word. Nor was this all, for those who subscribed this covenant were made also to "*protest* and call *the searcher of all hearts* as a witness, that their minds and hearts did fully agree with their oath and subscription, and that they were not moved to it by any *worldly respect*:" whereas it was notorious that the greatest part of those who thus swore and subscribed, "were driven to obedience by ministerial armies, which consisted at the beginning of Highlanders, whom the old Protestants called Argyle-apostles, who, by their *sacking* and *burning* of some good houses, *converted* more to the covenant than the ministers had done." (*Presby. Trial*, p. 29.) These facts



sufficiently display the atrocious persecuting spirit of the reformers in a full light; it only remains to say, that this cruel and bloodthirsty temper was fanned and exasperated by the horrible and furious preachings of Knox and his associates, who, like the devil, could quote scripture for every outrage and ruffianly deed that was committed. But none was more subject to their rancorous rage than the unfortunate Mary, their amiable and Catholic queen. She was persecuted with the most diabolical vengeance that could inflame the passions of fanatical zealots, until she ended her miserable days on the scaffold, by order of that tigress in human shape, the *virgin* queen Bess. This religious princess was even denied the consolations of her religion in her last moments, and was told by a reformed divine at her execution, "Your life would be the death of our religion, and your death will be the life of it." When the executioner struck off her head, he exclaimed, holding it up, "Long live queen Elizabeth, and so let the *enemies of the gospel perish!*" But enough of these brutalities masked by religious hypocrisy.

We have now given a succinct account of the rise of the Reformation, as it is called, in Scotland, the practices by which it was carried on, the consequences resulting from it, and the character of the men who headed the reforming party. We shall now close this part of our labours with observing, that the testimony we have produced, from Protestant authorities, be it remembered, does not accord with the unsupported assertions of the modern editors. They state that *subscriptions* were solicited to carry on the work of the Reformation; but Dr. Heylin shews it was carried on by sacrilege, violence, murder, and civil war; neither was the Reformation so completely effected as the modern editors would have their readers believe. The despotic and intolerant combination of fury and fanaticism called the covenant filled the kingdom with blood and desolation, and finally caused the overthrow of the constitution in church and state, as well as the violent death of the sovereign, Charles I. And are we, in these days, to have the rebellions, the devastations, the persecutions, and

the wild enthusiasm of the madbrained Covenanters held up as examples of praise and commendation? Surely the modern editors are like the Jews who crucified their Saviour, not knowing what they did. Whether what we have here said will open their eyes, and cause them to see their folly, not to say their infamy, because we are willing to believe they are ignorant of the mischief they are doing, is more than we can say; but we do flatter ourselves that the Protestant of liberal mind will see the motives which induced the pretended reformers of Scotland to shake off their obedience to the church of Rome in their true light, and appreciate the merit or infamy due to their actions.

PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION IN  
ENGLAND,

IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

The modern editors commence this interesting period of the Reformation with an account, taken from Burnet, of the qualities of the young king, who is represented as having "discovered very early a good disposition to religion and virtue, and a particular reverence for the scriptures; and was once greatly offended with a person, who, in order to reach something hastily, laid a great bible on the floor, and stood upon it." This story may do for bible-readers, but we see very little probability that a person would make such use of a book, or that a child so young should take upon himself to chide his elder. We are next told, that dissensions soon arose among the sixteen governors named in Harry's will, to have the care of the young king's person, and that these dissensions were no more than what might have been expected. The lord-chancellor Wriothesley imagined that he would be placed, in virtue of his office, as head of the commission of sixteen, but, by cunning and intrigue, the earl of Hertford, afterwards duke of Somerset, the king's uncle, was declared governor of the king's person, and protector of the kingdom. Thus he who had set so many wills and testaments aside to gratify his inordinate lust and ambition, had his own will disregarded and treated with as little ceremony as he had treated others. This appointment, we are next told, occasioned two parties to be formed, "the one headed by the protector, and the other by the chancellor; the favourers of the Reformation were of the former, and those that opposed it, of the latter." The consequences of this division in the government we shall see in the course of our review.

The first thing done, after the appointment of the protector, was the renewing of the commissions of the judges, and other state officers, and among the rest the bishops, who came and took out commissions, by which they were *to hold their bishoprics only during the king's pleasure!* Gentle reader! what do you think of these men, these pretended ministers of religion, who could thus submit to be the slaves, the obsequious tools of the faction in power? Cranmer, of whom we have had occasion to say so much, led the way in this work of degradation, and Burnet, another bishop of the established church, says, "this check upon the bishops was judged *expedient* in case they should *oppose* the Reformation;" that is, in case they should oppose the rapacity of the greedy courtiers, who were bent upon fleecing the church of what Harry had left. We are next told, that "an accident soon occurred which made way for great changes in the church. The curate and churchwardens of St. Martin's, in London, were brought before the council, for removing the crucifix, and other images, and putting some texts of scripture on the walls of their church, in the places where they stood; they answered, that in repairing their church they had removed the images, which being rotten they did not renew them, but put the words of scripture in their room; they had also removed others, which they found had been abused to idolatry. Great pains were taken by the Popish party to punish them severely, in order to strike a terror into others; but Cranmer was for the removing of all images set up in churches, as being expressly contrary both to the second commandment, and the practice of the purest Christians for many ages; and though, in compliance with the gross abuses of Paganism, much of the pomp of their worship was very early brought into the Christian church, yet it was long before images were introduced. At first, all images were condemned by the fathers; then they allowed the use, but condemned the worshipping, of them; and afterwards, in the eighth and ninth centuries, the worshipping of them was, after a long contest, both in the east and west, at

last generally received. Some, in particular, were believed to be more wonderfully endowed, and this was much improved by the cheats of the monks, who had enriched themselves by such means. And this abuse had now grown to such a height, that heathenism itself had not been guilty of greater absurdities towards its idols. Since all these abuses had risen out of the use of them, and the setting them up being contrary to the command of God, and the nature of the Christian religion, which is simple and spiritual, it seemed most reasonable to cure the disease in its root, and to clear the churches of images, that the people might be preserved from idolatry.

“These reasons prevailed so far, that the curate and churchwardens were dismissed with a reprimand; they were ordered to beware of such rashness for the future, and to provide a crucifix, and, till that could be had, were ordered to cause one to be painted on the wall. Upon this, Dr. Ridley, in a sermon preached before the king, inveighed against the superstition towards images and holy-water, and spread over the whole nation a general disposition to pull them down; which soon after commenced in Portsmouth.

“Upon this, Gardiner made great complaints; he said, that Lutherans themselves went not so far, for he had seen images in their churches. He distinguished between image and idol, as if the one, which, he said, only was condemned, was the representation of a false god, and the other of the true; and he thought, that as words conveyed by the ear begat devotion, so images, by the conveyance of the eye, might have the same effect on the mind. He also thought a virtue might be both in them and in holy water, as well as there was in Christ’s garments, Peter’s shadow, or Elisha’s staff; and there might be a virtue in holy-water, as well as in the water of baptism. To these arguments, which Gardiner wrote in several letters, the protector answered, that the bishops had formerly argued much in another strain, namely, that because the scriptures were abused by the vulgar readers, therefore they were not to be trusted to them; and



so made a pretended abuse the ground of taking away that which, by God's special appointment, was to be delivered to all Christians. This held much stronger against images forbidden by God. The brazen serpent set up by Moses, by God's own direction, was broken when abused to idolatry ; for that was the greatest corruption of religion possible ; but yet the protector acknowledged there was reason to complain of the forwardness of the people, who broke down images without authority ; to prevent which, in future, orders were sent to the justices of the peace to look well to the peace and government of the nation."—(*Book of Martyrs*, pp. 349, 350.)

It is necessary to notice the assertions here made by Burnet, with a view to delude his readers on the doctrine of venerating and using images in churches, and to screen the sacrilegious rapine of the reformers, who pillaged the shrines and altars to glut their own avarice. Cranmer, it is admitted, took the lead in this matter, as we have proved him heading every other measure of iniquity and outrage. He is stated to have grounded his advice for removing all the images set up in churches, as being contrary both to the second commandment, and the practice of the purest ages of Christianity. That "all images were condemned by the fathers ; then the *use* of them was allowed, but the *worshipping* of them was condemned." That abuses arose, and "had now grown to such a height, that heathenism itself had not been guilty of greater absurdities towards its idols." This is mere gratuitous assertion, unaccompanied by a single fact. The practice of using images is coeval with Christianity, and the worshipping or reverencing them was never condemned by the early fathers, but, on the contrary, the fathers wrote in defence of this doctrine. St. Gregory of Nyssa, who died late in the fourth century, and consequently lived in that age when Protestants admit the Christian church to have been pure, thus speaks to his audience, when celebrating the feast of the martyr Theodorus:—"When any one enters such a place as this, where the memory of this

just man and his relics are preserved, his mind is first struck—while he views the structure and all its ornaments—with the general magnificence that breaks upon him. The artist has here shewn his skill in the figures of animals, and the airy sculpture of the stone; while the painter's hand is most conspicuous in delineating the high achievements of the martyr: his torments; the savage forms of his executioners; their furious efforts; the burning furnace; and the happy consummation of the laborious contest. The figure of Christ is also beheld, looking down upon the scene. Thus, as in a book the letters convey the history, so do the colours describe the conflict of the martyr, and give the beauty of a flowery mead to the walls of our temple. The picture, though silent, speaks, and gives instruction to the beholder; nor is the mosaic pavement, which we tread on, less instructive.”—(*Orat. de Theod. Martyr.* t. ii., p. 1011.)

The *Book of Martyrs* says, the worshipping of images was generally received in the eighth and ninth centuries, after a long contest. This is an allusion to the heresy of the Iconoclasts or image destroyers, which was opposed by all the prelates of the Catholic church, and, like all other heresies, when possessed of the civil sword, was supported by brute force and persecution. The founder of this sect was the emperor Leo III., sprung from a plebeian family in Isauria. He, like the reformers in our Edward's reign, sent forth an edict, ordering the images of our Saviour, and his virgin mother, and the saints, to be removed out of the churches under the severest penalties. This extraordinary declaration against the *universal* practice of the Catholic church, excited murmurs and discontent at Constantinople, the seat of the empire. St. Germain, the patriarch of that see, tried by mild persuasion to disabuse the emperor of his error, and represented to him, that from the time of the apostles this relative honour had been paid to the images of Christ and his blessed mother. Leo was ignorant and obstinate: he commanded all the images and pictures to be collected and burned. The people resisted, and by an imperial

order were massacred without mercy. St. Germain was driven into banishment, and a temporising priest, another Cranmer, was thrust into his place. This took place in the year 729. The holy pope Gregory III., on coming to the papal chair, wrote a long epistle to the emperor, exhorting him to desist from his unholy purposes, and among other things he tells him, "Our churches in their rude state are but the work of the builders, a rough fabric of stone, of wood, of brick, of lime, and mortar. But within they are adorned with rich paintings, with historical representations of Jesus Christ and his saints. On these the converted gentiles, the neophytes, and children of the faithful, gaze with no less profit than delight. In these they behold the mysteries of our religion displayed before their eyes; by these they are animated to the practice of virtue, and silently taught to raise their affections and hearts to God. But of these external helps to virtue and religious information you have deprived the faithful; you have profanely stript the churches of their sacred ornaments, which so much contributed to edify, to instruct, and animate. In doing this you have usurped a power which God has not given to the sceptre. The empire and the priesthood have their respective powers, differing from each other in their use and object. As it belongs not to the bishop to govern within the palace, and to distribute civil dignities, so it does not belong to the emperor to command within the church, or to assume a spiritual jurisdiction, which Christ has left solely to the ministers of his altar. Let each one of us move and remain within the sphere to which he is called, as the apostle admonishes."—(*Reeve's Hist. of the Church*, vol. ii., p. 9.)

This emperor, however, continued the persecution whilst he lived, and his son Constantine Copronymus, when he mounted the throne, exceeded his father's barbarity, and extended the persecution through all the provinces. After a cruel reign of thirty-four years, Constantine was seized by death, and his son Leo followed his steps in harassing the church during the five years that he reigned. He was suc-

ceeded by his wife, the empress Irene, who, being a Catholic, gave peace to the church, and by her desire a council was called by pope Adrian, which assembled at Nice, on the 24th of September, 787. It consisted of 377 bishops, from Greece, Thrace, Natolia, the islands of the Archipelago, Sicily, and Italy. The prelates thus assembled were occupied in examining the fathers, the conduct of the Iconoclasts, and the objections made against the practice of venerating images. In the seventh session of the synod the bishops came to the following decision:—"After mature deliberation and discussion, we solemnly declare, that holy pictures and images, especially of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, of his immaculate Mother our Lady, of the angels and other saints, are to be set up in churches as well as in other places, that at the sight of them the faithful may remember what they represent; that they are to be venerated and honoured, not indeed with that supreme honour and worship, which is called Latria, and belongs to God alone, but with a relative and inferior honour, such as is paid to the cross, to the gospel, and other holy things, by the use of incense or of burning lights. For the honour paid to images passes to the archetypes or things represented, and he who reveres the image reveres the person it represents. Such has been the practice of our pious forefathers; such is the tradition of the Catholic church transmitted to us: this ecclesiastical tradition we closely hold conformably to the injunction given by St. Paul to the Thessalonians."—(2 *Thess.* c. ii., v. 14.) The decree was published and received with loud acclamations by the people; Iconoclasm died away, and was heard of no more, till the reformers of the sixteenth century thought fit to revive it with many other pernicious doctrines, that entailed misery upon the people where happiness before reigned. To shew the concurrent belief of the Catholic church in all ages on this ancient practice, we will here give the decree of the council of Trent, which sat at the same period when the work of devastation was going forward in England, by comparing which with the sentiments of

Gregory III. and the council of Nice, the reader will see that the doctrine of the Catholic church is invariable, and that what was taught in the eighth century was grounded on the universal practice of the church from the time of the apostles, as it was in the sixteenth century, and is now at the present day. The council of Trent decreed : " That images of Christ, of the blessed Virgin, and of other saints, are to be exposed and retained particularly in churches, and that due honour and veneration are to be shown them ; not as believing that any divinity or virtue is in them, for which they should be honoured ; or that anything is to be asked of them, or any trust be placed in them, as the Gentiles once did in their idols ; but because the honour given to pictures is referred to the prototypes, which they represent ; so that through the images, which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads and kneel, we may learn to adore Christ, and to venerate his saints."—(*Sess. xxv. de Invocat. SS., p. 289.*) Having thus clearly established the doctrinal part of the subject, we may now proceed to examine the motives which induced the reformers of the sixteenth century to adopt the violent measures of the Iconoclasts of the eighth, or, as Burnet says, " to clear the churches of images, that the *people* might be PRESERVED from idolatry."

But though, as Burnet would make us believe, the advisers of the youthful Edward were anxious to preserve the people from idolatry, they were not so feelingly alive to preserve for them those civil privileges which had hitherto made them a free and happy nation. Of this, however, we have not a word in the modern *Book of Martyrs* ; it is therefore necessary that we should supply the omission. The object of the modern editors is to mislead the public mind, and excite *hatred* against the Catholics and their religion ; ours is to elucidate the truth, and, by removing the veil of ignorance which has so long clouded the Protestant mind, dissipate those groundless prejudices which interested bigots have so long kept alive against the professors of the ancient faith of the kingdom. While the chief reformers were hypocritically



exclaiming against idolatry, or the use of images in churches, they were worshipping and paying adoration to the mammon of iniquity, and contriving means how to aggrandize themselves both in titles and estates. Though Harry's will was in some respects wholly disregarded, in others it was made to sanction the schemes of ambition which the factious leaders meditated. Set a beggar on horseback, and it is said he will ride to the devil; the same we may say of the prominent characters who ruled under Edward VI. Of the sixteen individuals named as executors to the late king's will, it was remarked that they were men hitherto but little known, having no claim to high birth, but raised to their present rank by the partiality of Harry, and their readiness to pander to his vices. Of their moral character some estimate may be formed from the fact, that after having solemnly sworn to see the last will and testament of their late master scrupulously fulfilled, they almost immediately absolved themselves from the obligation of that oath, to comply with the ambitious projects of the protector Hertford. In another point of view, however, where their personal interests were concerned, they took care that nothing should be neglected that could help their own aggrandizement. In the body of Henry's will there was a clause charging the executors with ratifying every gift, and performing every promise which he should have made before his death. Here was a sweeping charge, which it was resolved to turn to the best account. Dr. Lingard, in his *History of England*, says:—"What these gifts and promises might be, must, it was presumed, be known to Paget, Herbert, and Denny, who had stood high in the confidence, and been constantly in the chamber of the dying monarch. These gentlemen were therefore interrogated before their colleagues; and from their depositions it was inferred, that the king had intended to give a dukedom to Hertford, to create the earl of Essex, his queen's brother, a marquess, to raise the viscount Lisle and lord Wriothesley to the higher rank of earls, and to confer the title of baron on Sir Thomas Seymour, Sir Richard Rich, Sir John St.

Leger, Sir William Willoughby, Sir Edward Sheffield, and Sir Christopher Danby : and that, to enable the new peers to support their respective titles, he had destined for Hertford an estate in land of £800 per annum, with a yearly pension of £300 from the first bishopric which should become vacant, and the incomes of a treasurership, a deanery, and six prebends, in different cathedrals: for each of the others a proportionate increase of yearly income; and for the three deponents, Paget, Herbert, and Denny, 400 pounds, 400 marks, and 200 pounds. Two out of the number, St. Leger and Danby, had sufficient virtue to refuse the honours and revenues which were allotted to them: Hertford was created duke of Somerset, Essex marquess of Northampton, Lisle earl of Warwick, Wriothesley earl of Southampton, and Seymour, Rich, Willoughby, and Sheffield, barons of the same name: and to all these, with the exception of the two last, and to Cranmer, Paget, Herbert, and Denny, and more than thirty other persons, were assigned in different proportions manors and lordships out of the lands, which had belonged to the dissolved monasteries, or still belonged to the existing bishoprics. But Sir Thomas Seymour was not satisfied: as uncle of the king he aspired to office no less than rank: and to appease his discontent the new earl of Warwick resigned in his favour the patent of high admiral, and was indemnified with that of great chamberlain, which Somerset had exchanged for the dignities of lord high treasurer, and earl marshal, forfeited by the attainder of the duke of Norfolk. These proceedings did not pass without severe animadversion. Why, it was asked, were not the executors content with the authority which they derived from the will of their late master? Why did they reward themselves beforehand, instead of waiting till their young sovereign should be of age, when he might recompense their services according to their respective merits?" Thus the reader will see that though the crime of idolatry is represented as having touched the consciences of these menders of religion, they were not averse to the crimes of self-aggran-

dizement, robbery, and sacrilege. We should have added forgery too ; for the same historian remarks, that though the clause to the above effect appears in the body of the will, yet it is somewhat mysterious that it should be ordered, as the deponents testified, to be inserted only when the king was on his death bed, that is, about January the 28th, and the will purports to be executed three weeks before, on the 30th of December.

We must now notice the funeral of Henry. The ceremony was performed with very great pomp, and, while the body lay in state at Whitehall, *MASSSES* were said every day, so that it is as clear as the sun at noon-day, that though Protestants are now compelled, in order to qualify for civil office, to *swear* that the mass is idolatry, yet Cranmer, and all the crew of reformers at the beginning of Edward's reign, as well as the reign of the first pope of the English church, believed in and followed the doctrine and practice of this great sacrifice. The king himself, by his will, left 600*l.* a year for masses to be said for the repose of his soul ; but this part of his will was soon violated, and the money appropriated to other purposes, as he had impiously deprived others of the same religious benefit. Next followed the coronation of the young king, the ceremony of which was much shortened, and an alteration was made of so important a nature that we shall give the relation in Dr. Lingard's words. " That the delicate health of the young king," says the historian, " might not suffer from fatigue, the accustomed ceremony was considerably abridged : and, under respect for the laws and constitution of the realm, an important alteration was introduced into that part of the form which had been devised by our Saxon ancestors, to put the new sovereign in mind that he held his crown by the free choice of the nation. Hitherto it had been the custom for the archbishop, first to receive the king's oath to preserve the liberties of the realm, and then to ask the people if they were willing to accept him, and obey him as their liege lord. Now the order was inverted : and not only did the address to the people precede the oath of the king, but in

that very address they were reminded that he held his crown by descent, and that it was their duty to submit to his rule. 'Sirs,' said the metropolitan, 'I here present king Edward, rightful and undoubted inheritor, by laws of God and man, to the royal dignity and crown imperial of this realm, whose consecration, inunction, and coronation, is appointed by all the nobles and peers of the land to be this day. Will ye serve, at this time, and give your good wills and assents to the same consecration, inunction, and coronation, as by your duty of allegiance ye be bound to do?' When the acclamations of the spectators had subsided, the young Edward took the accustomed oath, first on the sacrament, and then on the book of the gospels. He was next anointed, after the ancient form: the protector and the archbishop placed on his head successively three crowns, emblematic of the three kingdoms of England, France, and Ireland; and the lords and prelates first did homage two by two, and then in a body promised fealty on their knees. Instead of a sermon, Cranmer pronounced a short address to the new sovereign, telling him that the promises that he had just made could not effect his right to sway the sceptre of his dominions. That right he, like his predecessors, had derived from God: whence it followed, that neither the bishop of Rome, nor any other bishop, could impose conditions on him at his coronation, nor pretend to deprive him of his crown on the plea that he had broken his coronation oath. Yet these solemn rites served to admonish him of his duties, which were, 'as God's vicegerent, and Christ's vicar, to see that God be worshipped, and idolatry be destroyed that the tyranny of the bishop of Rome be banished, and images be removed; to reward virtue, and revenge vice; to justify the innocent, and relieve the poor; to repress violence, and execute justice. Let him do this, and he would become a second Josias, whose fame would remain to the end of days.' The ceremony was concluded with a solemn high mass, sung by the archbishop."

Here we have Cranmer again upon the carpet. We see him not only teaching the young king to look upon himself

as holding the sceptre by *divine right*, and authorized to *persecute* for *religious opinions*, but we also see him celebrating that august sacrifice of the mass, which had been offered up ever since the introduction of Christianity, but which was soon after to be abolished, and by the instrumentality of this very archbishop. Thus, then, to Cranmer, who is so much extolled by the liberty-loving disciples of the Reformation, we may lay the loss, in the first instance, of those fundamental principles of civil freedom which distinguishes the genuine constitution of our country, and the conduct of our forefathers when Catholics, and the origin of those bitter grievances which the people have suffered from misrule and faction. Burnet, who is the trumpeter of Cranmer, speaks of this deviation for the first time from the form devised by our Saxon ancestors, as a matter of common place, though he acknowledges the alteration to have been a “remarkable” one. He says, “that formerly the king used to be presented to the people at the corner of the scaffold, and they were asked if they would have him to be their king? Which looked like a right of an election, rather than a ceremony of investing one that was already king. This was now changed, and *the people* were *desired* only to give assent and good will to his coronation, as by *duty of allegiance* they were bound to do.” This is the language of a church-of-England bishop, and one too who was raised to that dignity by William the Dutchman, who came over to this country to dethrone his father-in-law, having married James the Second’s eldest daughter, Mary, and was placed on the English throne during the life-time of James, not, indeed, by divine right, but by the consent of the people, who, in Edward’s reign, we are told by this bishop, had only to give their assent to the *coronation* as by duty of allegiance they were bound to do. Such was the regard which Cranmer, in the first instance, and Burnet, after him, had for the rights and privileges of the people.

We must now return again to the modern *Book of Martyrs*, or rather to *Burnet’s Abridgment*, from which the editors have selected their account. In order to justify the work of



desolation which followed the coronation of Edward VI., Burnet makes the following remarks on the Catholic doctrine of praying for the dead:—"The pomp of this endowment [alluding to Henry's bequest for daily masses for his soul] led people to examine into the *usefulness* of *soul-masses* and *obits*. Christ appointed the *sacrament* for a commemoration of his death among *the living*, but it was not *easy to conceive* HOW that was to be applied to *departed souls*; and it was evidently a project for drawing *the wealth of the world into their hands*. In the *primitive church* there was a *commemoration of the dead*, or an *honourable remembrance* of them made in the *daily offices*. But even this custom grew *into abuse*, and some *inferred* from it, that departed souls, unless they were signally pure, passed through a purgation in the next life, before they were admitted to heaven; of which St. Austin, *in whose time the opinion began to be received*, says, that it was taken up *without any sure ground in scripture*. But what was wanting in scripture-proof was supplied by *visions, dreams, and tales*, till it was *generally received*. King Henry had acted like one who did not much *believe it*, for he had deprived innumerable souls of the masses that were said for them in monasteries, by destroying those foundations. Yet he seems to have intended, that if masses could avail the departed souls, he would himself be secure; and as he *gratified the priests* by this part of his endowment, so he *pleased the people* by appointing sermons and *alms* to be given on such days. Thus he died as he had lived, wavering between both persuasions." The modern editors have here cut off the paragraph which goes on thus:—"And it occasioned no small debate, when men sought to find out what his opinions were in the controverted points of religion; for the *esteem* he was in, made both sides study to justify themselves, by seeming to follow his sentiments; the one party said, he was resolved never to alter religion, but only to cut off some abuses, and intended to go no further than he had gone. They did, therefore, vehemently press the others to innovate nothing, but to keep things in the

state in which he left them, till his son should come of age. But the opposite party said, that he had resolved to go a great way further, and particularly to turn the mass to a communion; and, therefore, religion being of such consequence to the salvation of souls, it was necessary to make all the haste in reformation that was fitting and decent."

This is Burnet's account, to cover the shameful robberies that preceded and accompanied the famous, or rather infamous, Reformation, of which he was the historian. Burnet was a bishop as well as a writer, but his sacred character did not prevent him from being as great a falsifier as ever sat down to write for the purpose of deception. We have proved, in the first volume of this Review, from the testimony of the fathers, that Christ appointed the eucharist to be *a sacrifice* as well as *a sacrament*; that there was a commemoration daily made in the mass for the dead as well as the living, in the primitive church; and that there was no difficulty among the faithful, in the pure ages of the church, nor is there any now, to conceive how the merits of Christ in the mass are applied to departed souls. But it is insinuated that the project of *soul-masses* and *obits* or *anniversaries*, was evidently broached for the purpose of drawing the wealth of the world into their hands. This insinuation comes with a bad grace from a bishop of the established church, whose brethren draw a great deal of wealth by their vocation, without doing much for it. Burnet forgot, or at least he did not wish his readers should know, the vast works of charity that were performed by the Catholic clergy through the revenues they derived from this custom of soul-masses; whereas, if we look to what has been done by the Protestant clergy since the change of religion, we shall find little for them to boast of. It is notorious that all the beautiful churches, all the noble hospitals, the magnificent monasteries, the colleges and halls of the universities, the public schools, and, in fact, every public building of utility and ornament, were chiefly raised by the revenues of the church, aided by the donations of pious laymen and women. Not a farthing was con-

tributed through compulsory means; the statute book in Catholic times does not contain one single clause imposing a tax upon the people to support those noble works of our forefathers, while it is notorious that numbers of the beautiful edifices were destroyed by the reformers, others were converted into profane uses, and even at this day the people, though taxed to the utmost to support a debt caused by a profligate and ruinous war, are compelled to pay an impost towards erecting new churches, the old ones having been suffered to fall into decay. The doctrine of purgatory, Burnet says, began to be received about the time of St. Austin: this is false, for St. Basil, long before St. Austin lived, maintained this doctrine, and Fox called him "the pillar of truth."—(*See Review*, vol. i. p. 257.) But let St. Augustin speak for himself, and then let the reader decide whether he said, as this lying bishop asserts, "that it [the doctrine of purgatory] was taken up without any sure ground in scripture." This great luminary of the Catholic church writes thus:—"Before the most severe and last judgment, some undergo temporal punishments in this life; some after death; and others both now and then. But not all that suffer after death are condemned to eternal flames. What is not expiated in this life, to some is remitted in the life to come, so that they may escape eternal punishment."—*De Civit. Dei*. L. xxi. c. xiii. T. v. p. 1432. "The prayers of the church and of some good persons are heard in favour of those Christians who departed this life, not so bad as to be deemed unworthy of mercy, nor so good as to be entitled to immediate happiness. So also, at the resurrection of the dead, there will some be found to whom mercy will be imparted, having gone through those pains to which the spirits of the dead are liable. Otherwise it would not have been said of some, with truth, that their sin *shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come* (Matt. xii. 32), unless some sins were remitted in the next world."—*Ibid.* c. xxiv. p. 1446. "It cannot be thought, that the souls of the dead are not relieved by the piety of the living,

when the sacrifice of our Mediator is offered for them, or alms are distributed in the church. They are benefited, who so lived as to have deserved such favours. For there is a mode of life, not so perfect as not to require this assistance, nor so bad as to be incapable of receiving aid. The practice of the church in recommending the souls of the departed, is not contrary to the declaration of the apostle, which says: *We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done, whether it be good or evil*, (2 Cor. v. 10). For this merit each one, in his life, has acquired, to be aided by the good works of the living. But all are not aided: and why so? Because all have not lived alike. When, therefore, the sacrifice of the altar or alms are offered for the dead; in regard to those whose lives were very good, such offices may be deemed acts of thanksgiving; acts of propitiation for the imperfect; and though to the wicked they bring no aid, they may give some comfort to the living.”—*Enchirid. c. cx. T. iii. p. 83.* “*Lord, chastise me not in thy anger; may I not be numbered with those, to whom thou wilt say: Go into eternal fire, which hath been prepared for the devil and his angels. Cleanse me so in this life, make me such, that I may not stand in need of that purifying fire, designed for those who shall be saved, yet so as by fire. And why, but because (as the apostle says) they have built upon the foundation, wood, hay, and stubble? If they had built gold and silver, and precious stones, they would be secured from both fires; not only from that in which the wicked shall be punished for ever, but likewise from that fire which will purify those who shall be saved by fire. But because it is said, he shall be saved, that fire is thought lightly of; though the suffering will be more grievous than anything man can undergo in this life.*”—*In Psal. xxxvii. T. viii. p. 127.* “It cannot be doubted, that, by the prayers of the holy church, and by the salutary sacrifice, and by alms which are given for the repose of their souls, the dead are helped; so that God may treat

them more mercifully than their sins deserved. This the whole church observes, which it received from the tradition of the fathers, to pray for those who died in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, when, in their turn, they are commemorated at the sacrifice, and it is then announced, that the sacrifice is offered for them.”—*De verbis Apostoli, Serm. xxxii. T. x. p. 154.* “We read in the second book of Maccabees (xii. 43), that sacrifice was offered for the dead; but though, in the old testament, no such words had been found, the authority of the universal church must suffice, whose practice is incontrovertible. When the priest at the altar offers up prayers to God, he recommends in them the souls of the departed. When the mind sometimes recollects that the body of his friend has been deposited near the tomb of some martyr, he fails not, in prayer, to recommend the soul to that blessed saint; not doubting that succour may thence be derived. Such suffrages must not be neglected, which the church performs in general words, that they may be benefited who have no parents, nor children, nor relations, nor friends.”—*De cura pro Mortuis. c. i, iv. T. pp. 288—290.* The same sentiment is repeated through the whole treatise, and we now leave it to the unbiassed Protestant to decide whether there was any difficulty among Catholic fathers, and divines, and people, to conceive how the efficacy of the mass was applied to departed souls.

We must allow that Henry acted like one who did not believe it, by his depriving so many souls of the benefit conferred by this Christian and divine sacrifice; but Harry was then blinded by his passions, as Burnet was by his interests; but when Henry came to the last point, and death was standing before him, he knew too well the value of this religious consolation to reject it at such an awful moment, though the Almighty so ordered that he should derive little or no advantage from it. In the passage we have added, and the modern editors suppressed, Burnet would persuade us that the monster in cruelty, Henry, was held *in esteem* by both parties. But where was the proof of this regard to the



deceased tyrant when his last will was neglected almost as soon as the breath had left his body? One party said he resolved never to alter religion, and yet it is very well known that he *did* alter it. The other party contended that he had resolved “to go a *great way further*, and particularly to turn the *mass* into a *communion*,” and therefore “it was necessary to make all the haste in reformation that was fitting and decent.” Well said, Gilbert Burnet; but what authority have you for this statement? If Harry intended to have turned the mass into a communion, would he have left such a sum of money as he did by his last will, to have masses said for the repose of his soul? Come, Gilbert, get over this awkward predicament. No, no; it was not the people who began to be inquisitive into the *usefulness* of *soul-masses*, but the factious leaders in the work of Reformation, who cast their longing eyes on the goods of the church which had escaped the rapacity of the preceding reign, and which they coveted the usefulness of for their own private gain. This it was that made them in such *haste* to commence the *change* in religion, which you, Gilbert Burnet, represent as being “of such consequence to the salvation of souls!” Let us now have an account of their proceedings from the *Book of Martyrs*. It says:—“The nation was in an ill condition for a war with such a mighty prince;—labouring under great distractions at home; the people generally crying out for a Reformation, *despising the clergy*, and *loving the new preachers*. The priests were, for the most part, very ignorant, and scandalous in their lives; many of them had been monks, and those who were to pay them the pensions which were reserved to them at the destruction of the monasteries, till they should be provided, took care to get them into some small benefice. The greatest part of the parsonages were impropriated, for they belonged to the monasteries, and the abbots had only granted the incumbents either the vicarage, or some small donative, and left them the perquisites raised by masses and other offices. At the suppression of those houses there was no care taken to make provision for

the incumbents ; so that they were in some measure compelled to continue in their idolatrous practices for subsistence.

“ Now these persons saw that a reformation of those abuses would deprive them of their means of existence ; and, therefore, they were at first zealous against all changes ; but the same principle made them comply with every change which was made, rather than lose their benefices. The clergy were encouraged in their opposition to the Reformation by the protection they expected from Gardiner, Bonner, and Tostall, men of great reputation, and in power ; and, above all, the lady Mary, the next heir to the crown, openly declared against all changes till the king should be of age.

“ On the other hand, Cranmer resolved to proceed more vigorously ; the protector was firmly united to him, as were the young king's tutors, and Edward himself was as much engaged as could be expected from so young a person ; for both his knowledge and zeal for true religion were above his age. Several of the bishops also declared for a Reformation, but Ridley, bishop of Rochester, was the person on whom Cranmer most depended. Latimer remained with him at Lambeth, and did great service by his sermons, which were very popular ; but he would not return to his bishopric, choosing rather to serve the church in a more disengaged manner. Assisted by these persons, Cranmer resolved to proceed by degrees, and to give the reasons of every advance so fully, that he hoped, by the blessing of God, to convince the nation of the fitness of whatsoever should be done, and thereby prevent the dangerous opposition that might otherwise be apprehended.”

We have here some more of Gilbert's falsehoods, but before we proceed to examine them, we must notice a trifling liberty the modern editors have taken with their text. We have more than once informed the reader that this account of the “ progress of the Reformation,” in the modern *Book of Martyrs*, is taken from Gilbert Burnet's “ Abridgement of the History of the Reformation,” &c. We have compared the above quotation with the original now before us, and we

find that Burnet thus speaks of Cranmer:—"But on the other hand, Cranmer, WHOSE GREATEST WEAKNESS WAS HIS OVER-OBSEQUIOUSNESS TO KING HENRY, BEING NOW AT LIBERTY, resolved to proceed more vigorously." Now, if the reader will turn to the last paragraph of the quotation, it will be seen that all the words we have put in small-capital letters have been omitted by the modern editors. So, then, these excitors of hatred against Popery were ashamed of the obsequiousness of their own dear Tom Cranmer, whose slavish compliance, under every circumstance, to the will of Henry, could not be passed over uncensured, even by his greatest flatterer, Gilbert Burnet. Well, but Tom was *now at liberty* to set about the godly work of Reformation, and it is time to see how he went to business. We are told that he "resolved to proceed by degrees," so that the nation might be convinced "of the fitness of whatsoever should be done." The first proceeding, we are informed, was an order for "a general visitation of all the churches in England, which was divided into six precincts: and two gentlemen, a civilian, a divine, and a register, were appointed for each of these. But before they were sent out, a letter was written to all the bishops, giving them notice of it, suspending their jurisdiction while it lasted, and requiring them to preach no where but in their cathedrals, and that the other clergy should not preach but in their own churches, without licence; by which it was intended to restrain such as were not acceptable, to their own parishes, and to grant the others licences to preach in any church of England. The *greatest difficulty the reformers found* was in the *want of able and prudent men*; most of the reformed preachers being *too hot and indiscreet*, and the few who were otherwise were required in London, and the universities." Here we have more disclosures not very creditable to the performers in this scene of civil and religious innovation. The commissioners were appointed by the privy council, and consisted of laymen as well as divines. These commissioners, on their arrival in any diocese, assumed the spiritual authority over the bishop himself, who was not

allowed to preach any where but in his own cathedral, and the other clergy were prohibited from preaching without a *license*. The commissioners further summoned the bishops, the clergy, and householders before them, and not only compelled them to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, but also to answer such questions on oath as might be put to them. Here was a comfortable state of freedom for Englishmen to enjoy ! But they had renounced the tyranny of the pope, and the slavery of the Catholic church, and therefore the despotic restrictions imposed upon them, being cloaked with the charm of evangelical liberty, the Reformation of religion was hailed as a blessing. What a change was here worked for the downfall of England's liberties, and the happiness of Englishmen. Heretofore religion was held as of divine right, and in the exercise of their spiritual functions the clergy had always been independent of the crown. Unfettered with the cares of wives and families, and enjoined, not only by the canons of the church, but by the laws of the kingdom, to follow the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, by visiting the sick, comforting the houseless, entertaining the stranger, and supporting the poor, their interests became identified with the privileges of the people, and they formed a barrier against the encroachments of the crown and the ambition of the nobles. Thus we see, in the tenth century, king Edgar, while acting by the advice and counsels of an archbishop of Canterbury, St. Dunstan, governing his people with the anxiety of a father, and watching the administration of justice with a jealous eye. Falling into the foul sin of adultery, he was brought to a sense of his crime, and retraced his steps by making atonement for the scandal he had given to religion and morality. We are aware that the conduct of St. Dunstan has been censured as arrogant and insolent, by many of our modern writers, who wrote for profit and not for truth ; but did the courageous and noble-minded archbishop do more than Nathan, who reprov'd king David to his face for the offence he had committed ? And would St. Dunstan have dared to reprove the king had he taken out a commission

from Edgar, as the reforming bishops did under Edward the Sixth ?

Again, in the eleventh century, we see St. Anselm withstanding the innovations attempted by William Rufus, who, like his Norman father, governed the kingdom more by his own capricious and despotic will than by the laws and customs of the country, established and confirmed by the Saxon monarchs. No threats nor persuasions could induce the holy Anselm to relinquish his own rights, or sanction the violation of others. He preferred banishment and poverty to ease and riches in his see, and he outlived the tyrant by whom he was persecuted. But had Anselm been a man of the world, like Tom Cranmer ; had he been encumbered with a wife and family, like our Protestant prelates ; had he held his high possessions through the influence and will of the sovereign, would he have had the courage to withstand the power of the monarch, and brave the storms which gathered around him, in the rigid performance of duty ? Oh, no ! the endearments of his wife, the cries of his children, the love of pleasure, and the fear of distress, would have influenced him, and he would probably have been as ready a slave to the whims of Rufus, as Tom Cranmer is acknowledged by Burnet to have been to the will of Henry, and as we shall shew him to have been to the will of the protector.

So, in the next century, we find St. Thomas à Becket resisting the encroachments meditated by Henry II., in the constitution of the country. St. Thomas was the first Englishman who rose to any considerable station under the Norman race of kings. He was well versed in the canon and civil law, was made lord chancellor, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. On being raised to the primate's chair, he resigned his civil office, considering the two offices to be incompatible with each other. Henry, like other ambitious sovereigns, meditated pretensions contrary to the established privileges of the constitution, and he required the assent of the archbishop. St. Thomas had taken an oath to preserve these privileges, and he refused to violate that oath



and the constitution at the same time. This was the head and front of the archbishop's offence, and yet to this day his memory is maligned, and his patriotic firmness misrepresented. Even the great Sir Walter Scott, in his last novel, that famous vehicle for calumny and abuse of the Catholic church, has spoken of the conduct of St. Thomas in the most injurious and unjustifiable terms. The archbishop is represented by the popular novelist, who, by-the-by, is a thorough-paced Tory, as a proud and imperious prelate, which impression, we suppose, he borrowed from his countryman, Hume. The latter base and unprincipled writer, insinuates that St. Thomas à Becket was proud and ambitious and covered his vicious inclinations with the cloak of sanctity and zeal for religion. Had St. Thomas not been a churchman, he would probably have been held in as high esteem as the most renowned of our statesmen since the Reformation, but it was his misfortune, as the world will say, to be a Catholic prelate, and therefore, though his resistance to the will of Henry was purely conscientious, and he refrained from entering into any party strife, yet he is foully attacked by the infidel Hume; and the rage and violences of Henry, which ended in the archbishop's death, are extenuated. Had St. Thomas been a panderer and a base violator of his oaths, like Cranmer; had he renounced the visible head of that divine religion, through whose influence we owe all that is valuable and venerable in our constitution; had he consented, like Cranmer, to become the mere tool and lieutenant of the king, exercising the functions of his office to cheat the people of their rights and customs, and enrich the hungry expectants that crowd a vicious court out of the patrimony of the poor, we should have seen him extolled as one of the best benefactors of mankind, though he would have been, as Cranmer was, the disgrace of his sacred profession, and the curse of this once happy country. But St. Thomas was a disinterested and firm supporter of the laws and privileges of his country, and a Catholic prelate; it was not fit therefore that the Protestant people should be told the truth. Cranmer was a base

truckler, a vicious sensualist, and a traitor to the constitution ; but he was an instrument in bringing about that reformation which has led to all the evils the country has suffered, and will yet suffer—it is therefore necessary that the truth should here too be disguised ;—thus the brave and good prelate is represented as ambitious and arrogant for doing his duty ; while the corrupt and dissembling prelate, who basely betrayed his trust, is described as the paragon of excellence and perfection.

In the thirteenth century we have another example of the great advantages derived to civil freedom and the people's rights, by an independent and disinterested clergy. To whom does England owe so much, next to Alfred and Edward the confessor, as to cardinal Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, who advised and instructed the barons of England to curb the despotic conduct of an unprincipled king, and demand a restoration of the Saxon laws, which the Norman conqueror and his successors had abrogated ? As might be expected, John, the reigning monarch, resisted this demand ; but, encouraged by the counsels and example of the patriotic and inflexible primate, the barons persisted in their claims, and at length compelled the king to sign the great charter of English liberties, which was faithfully preserved till the bloody reign of Henry, the wife and priest slaughterer, when Cranmer and his associates in the work of reform, or rather of devastation, consented to its violation, by making the church the footstool of the state, and placing its ministers in subserviency to the will of the king and his courtiers.

Burnet has confessed that Cranmer was *over obsequious to the will of Henry*, nor was he less compliant to the will of the lord protector, after he was released from the control of the lustful and inexorable despot. On attaining the summit of power, Hertford allowed Cranmer to make some progress in what they called a reform, without the consent of parliament, and Cranmer, in return, assured the protector that he would find the episcopal order, who now held their sees during the pleasure of the crown, ready instruments to fulfil

the wishes of their masters. Gardiner was the only bishop who stood out for episcopal rights, and he soon found himself in a prison. But what does Burnet himself say of the capabilities and character of the reformers? "The greatest difficulty the reformers found was the want of *able* and *prudent men*; most of the REFORMED PREACHERS being TOO HOT and INDISCREET, and the *few* who were otherwise were required in London and the universities. Therefore (he adds) they intended to make those *as common as was possible*, and appointed them to preach as ITINERANTS and VISITORS." The latter sentence of this quotation the wise editors of the modern *Book of Martyrs* have suppressed, thinking, we suppose, it reflected no great credit on the work they were extolling. But what, gentle reader, will you say of that Reformation which was not performed by "able and prudent men," but was the work of "*hot and indiscreet*" preachers? Could a change of religion be good and true that had such hands to produce it? The Catholic religion was first founded by the apostles, who were inspired men, and renowned for their virtues, prudence, and invincible constancy. They selected others equally eminent for piety, integrity, and purity of conduct, to carry the faith delivered to them to other nations, and we find by the page of history, that kingdom after kingdom was subdued to the Catholic faith by holy, able, and prudent men, till, in a word, the whole world had been converted from Paganism, and acknowledged the cross of Christ. We have it in the annals of our own country, that, at the close of the sixth century, St. Gregory the Great, who then filled the chair of St. Peter at Rome, sent a holy and prudent man, St. Augustin, to preach the Catholic faith to the Saxon inhabitants of Britain, and that, aided by other able and prudent men, the whole island, in a short space of time, became Catholic, and so continued through a series of nine hundred years, producing, during that period, the most just laws, the most valiant and wise kings, nobles, and legislators, the most pious and charitable prelates and priests, and the most learned and experienced scholars. And

now we are unblushingly told, by the panegyrists of what is called "THE REFORMATION," that the change from Catholicism to Protestantism was the work of men who were wholly destitute of the qualities requisite to be a true servant of religion, being devoid of prudence and ability, and influenced by passion and indiscretion. From such a tree is it possible that good fruit could come? Need we wonder at the numerous evils that have sprung from this unhappy change from good to bad; from a system of perfect liberty and justice, to a chaos of licentiousness and oppression? The wonder is, that the people have remained so long under the reign of folly and delusion, but that wonder ceases when we reflect on the pains taken by interested and unprincipled writers to disguise and deface the truth, which, however, has been preserved by the care of learned and trusty scholars, and we rejoice to say is now making rapid progress among a people so long the dupes of designing men, an illustration of which we shall now proceed to give the reader.

Speaking of the progress of this hitherto unheard-of visitation, the editors of the modern *Book of Martyrs* say:—"The injunctions made by Cromwell, in the former reign, for instructing the people, for removing images, and putting down all other customs abused to superstition; for reading the scriptures, saying the litany in English, for frequent sermons and catechising, for the exemplary lives of the clergy, their labours in visiting the sick, reconciling differences, and exhorting the people to charity, &c., were now renewed; and all who gave livings by simoniacal bargains, were declared to have forfeited their right of patronage to the king. A great charge was also given for the strict observation of the Lord's day, which was appointed to be spent wholly in the service of God, it not being enough to hear mass or matins in the morning, and spend the rest of the day in drunkenness and quarrelling, as was commonly practised; but it ought to be all employed, either in the duties of religion, or in acts of charity. Direction was also given for the saying of prayers, in which the king, as supreme

head, the queen, and the king's sisters, the protector and council, and all orders of persons in the kingdom, were to be mentioned. Injunctions were also given for the bishops to preach four times a year in all their diocesses, once in their cathedral, and thrice in any other church, unless they had a good excuse to the contrary; that their chaplains should preach often; and that they should give orders to none but to such as were duly qualified. The visitors, at length, ended the visitation, and in London and every part of England, the images—for *refusing to bow down to which, many a saint had been burnt*—were now committed to the flames." What we have here quoted is a *selection* from Burnet, with an *addition* of their own. The modern editors have shamefully violated the truth in stating that *many a SAINT* had been *burned* for refusing to bow down to images, as there is not a single burning on record for such an offence. We challenge the assertors to the proof, and we boldly defy them to produce one authenticated case of a saint, or even a sinner, having suffered for refusing to bow down to an image. What can we think of that cause which requires FALSEHOOD for its support? What are we to think of those men who can have recourse to such detestable practices to vilify and malign their neighbour's good name, and blind the unsuspecting reader? Having detected this *addition* to Burnet's tales, we shall now notice a *suppression* which the modern editors have been guilty of, on a very important subject. Among the directions given for praying, Burnet says, "they were also to PRAY FOR DEPARTED SOULS, that at the last day *we with them might rest both body and soul*." This order too clearly proved that the reformers in Edward's day held, at first, the doctrine of purgatory and praying for the dead, which they afterwards abolished, when they had stripped the church of all the chantries, and violated the testamentary deeds of their ancestors, by appropriating the money left for masses for the repose of the souls of the testators, to their own use. So clear a testimony of the Catholic doctrine, though recorded by Burnet, was too much



for the modern editors, who profess to convey a true knowledge of Christianity to their readers, and therefore it was omitted. Thus the ignorant reader is confirmed in his ignorance, while they pretend to have the desire of enlightening him. The modern editors could not be ignorant themselves that this doctrine was not only *enjoined*, but even *followed* by Cranmer and his associates at this time, for Collier, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, alluding to the death of the king of France, Francis I., on which occasion the injunction suppressed by the modern editors was observed by the too hot and indiscreet preachers, says:—"on the 19th of June, a *dirge* was sung for him in all the churches of London. The choir of St. Paul's was hung with mourning, and no other circumstance of state or solemnity omitted. The archbishop of Canterbury (CRANMER), with *eight* other bishops, in their richest *pontifical* habits, sung a *MASS ad requiem*, and a sermon was preached by Dr. Ridley, elect of Rochester." So, then, the reforming bishops, with Cranmer at their head, did not scruple to celebrate that august sacrifice which Protestants now swear is damnable idolatry, to qualify themselves for office under the crown of England. But it was necessary to keep up appearances for the present; therefore, while these hypocrites were complying with the forms of the old religion, the preachers were ordered to inveigh against the doctrines of the Catholic church, in order to prepare the people for the change which the courtiers meditated. These proceedings did not pass, however, without opposition. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and some other of the prelates, stood so stoutly in the old belief, that neither threats nor persuasions could move them; and the princess Mary, afterwards queen, wrote to the protector, telling him that the changes made and about to be made, "were contrary to the honour due to her father's memory, and that it was against their duty to the king to enter upon such points, and endanger the public peace, before he was of age." The protector wrote for answer, "that her father had died before he could finish the *good things* he had intended

concerning *religion*; and had expressed his regret, both before himself and many others, that he left things in so unsettled a state; and assured her, that nothing should be done but what would turn to the glory of God, and the king's honour." What hypocrisy and blasphemy! We shall soon see how far the glory of God, and the honour of the king was respected by these base and iniquitous scourges of a once happy people.

The *Book of Martyrs* next proceeds to detail the new acts passed by the first and only parliament of Edward, but it does not furnish us with the origin of this parliament. The mode of selecting it was so dissimilar to the elections in the time of Catholicism, and was attended with such dire consequences to the nation at large, that we shall give it in the words of Dr. Heylin, a Protestant divine, from his *History of the Reformation*. The doctor says:—"And now it is high time to attend the parliament, which took beginning on the fourth of November and was prorogued on the twenty-fourth of December following: in which the cards were so well packed by Sir Ralph Sadler, that there was no need of any other shuffling till the end of the game. This very parliament, without any sensible alteration of the members of it, being continued by prorogation from session to session, until at last it ended by the death of the king. For a preparatory whereunto Richard lord Rich was made lord chancellor on the twenty-fourth of October; and Sir John Baker chancellor of the court of first fruits and tenths, was nominated speaker for the House of Commons. And that all things might be carried with as little opposition and noise as might be, it was thought fit that bishop Gardiner should be kept in prison till the end of the session; and that bishop Tonsal of Durham (a man of a most even and moderate spirit) should be made less in reputation, by being deprived of his place at the council table. And though the parliament consisted of such members as disagreed amongst themselves in respect of religion, yet they agreed well enough together in one common principle, which was to serve the present time

and preserve themselves. For though a great part of the nobility, and not a few of the chief gentry in the House of Commons, were cordially affected to the church of Rome; yet were they willing to give way to all such acts and statutes as were made against it, out of a fear of losing such church lands as they were possessed of, if that religion should prevail and get up again. And for the rest, who either were to make, or improve their fortunes, there is no question to be made, but that they came resolved to further such a resolved to further such a Reformation, as should most visibly conduce to the advancement of their several ends. Which appears plainly by the strange mixture of the acts and results thereof; some tending simply to God's glory, and the good of the church; some to the present benefit and enriching of particular persons; and some again being devised of purpose to prepare a way for exposing the revenues of the church unto spoil and rapine." Look at this account, sensible reader, and then go back to the time of John, when Langton and the barons stipulated for the nation's freedom and rights. Alas, what a change! When the Catholic religion flourished, the parliaments were freely elected, and lasted only during the session, so that parliaments were as frequent as they were free. It was only in the preceding reign that parliaments were packed to carry the changes and inroads on the religion and constitution of the country against the will of the people, and we here see how the system of corruption was improved upon. Here we have an assemblage of men influenced by the basest motives, and packed for the worst ends, legislating for the church as well as the state, and forming new articles of faith, at the whim of the moment. Here we have it avowed that they were actuated not with a love of country or of truth, but with the sordid view of enriching themselves by the spoil and rapine of the revenues of the church, which had already suffered severely in the former reign. Here it is distinctly stated that the REFORMATION, as it is called, was promoted by laymen under the fear that they would be obliged, in the event of the old order of things being restored,

to give up the ill-gotten goods they were possessed of, which did not suit their worldly views. Such then was the origin of that change of religion which took place in this country in the sixteenth century, after having been Catholic nine hundred years. Is it possible that the change could be good, springing as it did from such a source?

Of the acts passed by this parliament, some were of a civil nature, and others regarded matters of conscience. The most material, however, was the act for placing the funds of the chantries, colleges, free chapels, and hospitals, which had escaped the rapacity of the late king, at the disposal of the reigning monarch, that he might employ them in providing for the poor, increasing the salaries of the preachers, and endowing free schools for the diffusion of learning. All this however was no more than pretence; for the harpies of the court took especial care that very little of the spoil should be applied to public purposes. Dr. Heylin says there were then no less than ninety colleges, which being for the ends of education, why were they destroyed to make room for free schools? Of this we shall say more hereafter. Another act was for the regulation of the election of bishops, by which the originators intended to weaken the episcopal authority, "by forcing them," writes Dr. Heylin, "from their strong hold of divine institution, and making them no other than the king's ministers only, his ecclesiastical *sheriffs* (as a man might say), to execute his will, and disperse his mandates. And of this act [continues the doctor] such use was made (though possible beyond the true intention of it), that the bishops of those times were not in a capacity of conferring orders, but as they were thereunto impowered by especial licence. The tenor whereof (if Sanders is to be believed) was in these words following: viz. *the king to such a bishop, greeting, whereas all and all manner of jurisdiction, as well ecclesiastical as civil, flows from the king as from the supreme head of all the body, &c. We therefore give and grant to thee full power and licence, to continue during our good pleasure, for holding ordination within thy diocese of*

*N. and for promoting fit persons unto holy orders, even to that of the priesthood.* Which being looked on by queen Mary, not only as a dangerous diminution of the episcopal power, but as an odious innovation in the church of Christ, she caused this act to be repealed in the first year of her reign, leaving the bishops to depend on their former claim, and to act all things which belonged to their jurisdiction in their own names, and under their own seals, as in former times. In which estate they have continued, without any legal interruption, from that time to this. But in the first branch there was somewhat more than what appeared at the first sight: for, though it seemed to aim at nothing but that the bishops should depend wholly on the king for their preferment to those great and eminent places; yet the true drift of the design was to make deans and chapters useless for the time to come, and thereby to prepare them for a dissolution."

But the most arbitrary and diabolical piece of tyranny remains yet to be recorded. This was the act legalizing SLAVERY in once free England, under the pretence of suppressing mendicity. This circumstance we must give in the words of Dr. Lingard.—“The mendicants, who had formerly obtained relief at the gates of the monasteries and convents, now wandered in crowds through the country, and by their numbers and importunities often extorted alms from the intimidated passenger. To abate this nuisance a statute was enacted, which will call to the recollection of the reader the barbarous manners of our pagan forefathers. Whoever ‘lived idly and loiteringly for the space of three days,’ came under the description of a vagabond, and was liable to the following punishment. Two justices of the peace might order the letter V to be burnt on his breast, and adjudge him to serve the informer two years as his slave. His master was bound to provide him with bread, water, and refuse meat; might fix an iron ring round his neck, arm or leg, and was authorized to compel him to ‘labour at any work, however vile it might be, by beating, chaining, or otherwise.’ If the slave absented himself a fortnight, the letter S was burnt on his cheek or



forehead, and he became a slave for life : and if he offended a second time in the like manner, his flight subjected him to the penalties of felony. Two years later this severe statute was repealed." Burnet attempts to soften the severity of this infamous deed of the evangelical reformers, by insinuating that it was "chiefly intended to operate against the vagrant monks who went about the country infusing into the people a dislike of the government ;" but Lingard in a note on this law, says,—“ Similar penalties were enacted against clerks convict, who were no longer to make their purgation. Hence it has been inferred, I conceive erroneously, that the severity of the statute was chiefly directed against some of the monks who are supposed to have become beggars, and to have railed against the government. (Burnet, ii. 45.) The young king in his journal calls it ‘ an extreme law.’ (Edward’s Journal in Burn. p. 5).”

Of this law for *making slaves of Englishmen* it is impossible to speak in measured language, or to stifle those feelings of indignation which arise at the very thought of such a measure. What would a Langton, what would our Catholic ancestors have said or done, had such a tyrannous and diabolical law been proposed to make slaves of them, in case they felt the iron hand of poverty ? Well, thank Heaven, this law was the fruit of Protestant legislation ; it was an offspring of the Reformation which Englishmen are now taught to praise and admire, while a majority of them are steeped in misery, and numbers are made to supply the place of beasts of burden. Talk of the tyranny of the pope ; of the slavery of Popery ! Alas ! who are greater slaves than the labourers of England at this moment, who are not allowed to reap the profit of their labour, but are compelled to give more than one third of it to support a race of idle and profligate tax-eaters. In some measure the present state of England is not unlike the state she was in under Edward VI. Schemes were entered into then to suppress mendicancy, which had been increased to a frightful degree by the rapacious spoiliations of the court ; and schemes have been proposed in

our days to reduce the population in consequence of the increase of pauperism arising from the plundering of state cormorants. Masters were authorized by Edward's statute to cause the slave to perform any work, however vile, by beating and chaining; and in our own days men have been harnessed to carts to drag gravel, by order of the overseers, and the whip is only wanted to complete the parallel.

There is one other act of this parliament of Edward which we must not overlook. It is that which legalized the marriages of the parsons, and legitimated their children. By this law a heavy burden was entailed on the people, and the tithes which heretofore had gone to repair churches and feed the poor, were not only given solely to the parsons, but were found inadequate to maintain them, and millions have been voted to support the poor clergy out of the public taxes. The church and the poor were thrown upon the land and trade; the parsons' sons and daughters are many of them fastened upon the taxes through the sinecure and half-pay lists; and the bishops are not unmindful of their families, as they take care to promote their sons and sons-in-law to benefices in preference to others, though perhaps more able candidates, and thus the church property is made a kind of family patrimony between the patrons and the prelates. Now this was not the case in Catholic times; then the poor man's son stood as good a chance of a parish or a mitre, if he possessed merit and abilities, as the son of the most powerful nobleman; and the property of the church, as we have before observed, was expended in useful and charitable purposes. This is one of the blessings of the Reformation, and, to throw dust in the eyes of the people, these parsons are ever and anon reviling the Catholic church for not allowing *her* ministers to marry, contending that it is contrary to the word of God, though the word is more in favour of celibacy than otherwise. But what shall we say, after all the abuse that has been lavished on Catholics since the commencement of the glorious work of reform, and especially after the passing of the parson-marrying law, to the schemes

lately proposed, and we believe actually brought into parliament, to prevent THE POOR FROM MARRYING! Not, reader, the poor clergymen, but the poor laymen and women. And this infernal proposition originated, too, with a Protestant parson. How glorious is the inconsistency, and how great the blessings of Protestantism!

Before we proceed further, we must recall the reader's attention to the consequences which resulted from the act which granted possession of chantries, colleges, &c., to the king. Of these establishments, besides the greater and lesser monasteries, which had been dissolved by Harry, the number was computed to be about 2374, all endowed with lands, pensions, and moveable goods, to an immense value. "When the law passed," says Mr. Collier, "for their dissolution, the act promised the estates of these foundations should be converted to *good and godly uses*, in erecting grammar schools, in further augmenting universities, and better provision for the poor and needy. But these lands being mostly shared *amongst the courtiers*, and others of *the rich laity*, the promise of the preamble was, in a great measure, impracticable." Dr. Heylin is more diffuse in relating the rapacious and scandalous proceedings of this reign, in his *History of the Reformation*. As many of the present aristocracy owe their estates and rank to the spoliations and sacrileges of the courtiers of Henry and Edward, and as the work of Dr. Heylin is little known at this time, and the transactions he alludes to, much less, from the base cupidity of our popular historians, who wrote for *lucre*, and not for *truth*, we will here give the doctor's words, which, though long, will, nevertheless, be deemed important and interesting. He writes:—"In the next place, we must attend the king's commissioners, dispatched in the beginning of March into every shire throughout the realm, to take a survey of all colleges, free-chapels, chantries, and brotherhoods, within the compass of the statute or act of parliament. According to the return of whose commissions, it would be found no difficult matter to put a just estimate and value on so great

a gift, or to know how to parcel out, proportion, and divide the spoil betwixt all such, who had before in hope devoured it. In the first place, as lying nearest, came in the free-chapel of St. Stephen, originally founded in the palace at Westminster, and reckoned for the chapel-royal of the court of England. The whole foundation consisted of no fewer than thirty-eight persons: viz., one dean, twelve canons, thirteen vicars, four clerks, six choristers, besides a verger, and one that had the charge of the chapel. In place of whom, a certain number were appointed for officiating the daily service in the royal chapel (gentlemen of the chapel they are commonly called), whose salaries, together with that of the choristers and other servants of the same, amount to a round yearly sum: and yet the king, if the lands belonging to that chapel had been together, and honestly laid unto the crown, had been a very rich gainer by it; the yearly rents thereof being valued at 1085*l.* 10*s.* 5*d.* As for the chapel itself, together with a cloister of curious workmanship, built by John Chambers, one of the king's physicians, and the master of the same, they are still standing as they were; the chapel having been since fitted and employed for an house of commons in all times of parliament.

“ At the same time also fell the college of St. Martin's, commonly called St. Martin's le Grand, situate in the city of London, not far from Aldersgate: first founded for a dean and secular canons, in the time of the conqueror, and afterwards privileged for a sanctuary; the rights whereof it constantly enjoyed, without interruption, till all privilege of sanctuary was suppressed in this realm by king Henry VIII. But the foundation itself being now found to be superstitious, it was surrendered into the hands of king Edward VI.; who after gave the same, together with the remaining liberties and precincts thereof to the church of Westminster: and they, to make the best of the king's donation, appointed, by a chapter held the seventh of July, that the body of the church, with the choir and isles, should be leased out for fifty years, at the rent of five marks per annum, to one H. Keeble, of

London ; excepting out of the said grant, the bells, lead, stone, timber, glass, and iron, to be sold and disposed of for the sole use and benefit of the said dean and chapter. Which foul transaction being made, the church was totally pulled down, a tavern built in the east part of it : the rest of the site of the said church and college, together with the whole precinct thereof, being built upon with several tenements, and let out to strangers ; who very industriously affected to dwell therein (as the natural English since have done) in regard of the privileges of the place, exempted from the jurisdiction of the lord mayor and sheriffs of London, and governed by such officers amongst themselves as are appointed thereunto by the chapter of Westminster.

“ But for this sacrilege the church of Westminster was called immediately in a manner to a sober reckoning ; for the lord protector, thinking it altogether unnecessary that two cathedrals should be founded so near one another, and thinking that the church of Westminster (as being of a late foundation) might best be spared, had cast a longing eye upon the godly patrimony which remained unto it. And being then unfurnished of a house or palace proportionable unto his greatness, he doubted not to find room enough upon the dissolution and destruction of so large a fabrick, to raise a palace equal to his vast designs. Which coming to the ears of Benson, the last abbot and first dean of the church, he could bethink himself of no other means to preserve the whole, but by parting, for the present, with more than half the estate which belonged unto it. And thereupon a lease is made of seventeen manors and good farms, lying almost altogether in the county of Gloucester, for the term of ninety-nine years ; which they presented to the lord Thomas Seymour, to serve as an addition to his manor at Sudley : humbly beseeching him to stand their good lord and patron, and to preserve them in a fair esteem with the lord protector. Another present of almost as many manors and farms, lying in the counties of Gloucester, Worcester, and Hereford, was made for the like term to Sir John Mason, a special confidant of the duke's ;



not for his own, but for the use of his great master ; which, after the duke's fall, came to Sir John Bourn, principal secretary of the state in the time of queen Mary. And yet this would not serve the turn till they had put into the scale their manor of Islip, conferred upon that church by king Edward the Confessor ; to which no fewer than two hundred customary tenants owed their soil and service : and being one of the best wooden things in those parts of the realm, was to be granted also without impeachment of waste, as it was accordingly. By means whereof the deanery was preserved for the later times : how it succeeded with the bishopric we shall see hereafter. Thus Benson saved the deanery, but he lost himself ; for, calling to remembrance that formerly he had been a means to surrender the abbey, and was now forced on the necessity of dilapidating the estate of the deanery, he fell into a great disquiet of mind, which brought him to his death within a few months after."

The doctor then goes on :— " I had not singled these two (I mean St. Martin's and St. Stephen's) out of all the rest, but they were the best and richest in their several kinds, and that there was more depending on the story of them than on any others. But ' bad examples seldom end where they first began.' For the nobility and inferior gentry, possessed of patronages, considering how much the lords and great men of the court had improved their fortunes by the suppression of those chantries and other foundations, which had been granted to the king, conceived themselves in a capacity of doing the like, by taking into their hands the yearly profits of those benefices, of which, by law, they were entrusted with the presentations. Of which abuse, complaint is made by bishop Latimer, in his printed sermons. In which we find, ' that the gentry at that time invaded the profits of the church, leaving the title only to the incumbent : and that chantry priests were put by them into several cures, to save their pensions ; (p. 38 ) that many benefices were laid out in free farms, (p. 71.) or given unto servants, for keeping of hounds, hawks, and horses, and for making of gardens

(pp. 91, 114).’ And finally, ‘that the poor clergy being kept to some sorry pittance, were forced to put themselves into gentlemen’s houses, and there to serve as clerks of the kitchen, surveyors, receivers, &c. (p. 241).’ All which enormities (though tending so apparently to the dishonour of God, the disservice of the church, and the disgrace of religion) were generally connived at by the lords and others, who only had the power to reform the same; because they could not question those who had so miserably invaded the church’s patrimony, without condemning of themselves.”

Here let us pause a moment, and reflect upon the scenes thus described, and those which have passed since they occurred. What apology can be offered for the outrages thus committed? Could Popery, with all its imputed corruptions and oppressions, produce calamities equal to what befel the country under the hands of the evangelical reformers? Burnet tells us the clergy were ignorant in the time of Popery; but the vast amount of valuable books and manuscripts destroyed by the sackings and burnings of public libraries, proved the careful regard in which learning was held by the calumniated Catholic clergy, and the little value that was set upon it by the reformers. See too the respect shewn by the godly reformers for the clergy, by causing them to serve the most menial offices in their families, to avoid the horrors of starvation. Then again the appropriation of a portion of the tithes to lay purposes, many of the lords and gentry at this day deriving a part of their income from the tithes thus diverted from their original purport. All these things considered, and many more that might be added, can any reasonable being conceive that religion had any hand in this pretended Reformation, unless, indeed, to cloak the villanies of the devastators? Oh! how deeply have the people had occasion to deplore this eventful period. Penalties upon penalties have been enacted to restrain their comfort and abridge their liberties. New offences have been heaped upon each other in the statute book, till the most wary have reason to fear they may become trespassers. From the time of the

separation of this kingdom from the church of Rome, the laws have been multiplied a hundred fold, and so numerous are they grown, and so complicated in their bearings, that the wisest lawyer existing cannot digest them. Taxes have been imposed on the people till the country is brought nearly to the brink of ruin, and, as in the time of Edward, while the rich are rioting in luxury, the working classes are starving in the midst of plenty.

Among other devices in the work of reform was the abolition of certain religious ceremonies, and the curtailment of the amusements of the people. Of these the *Book of Martyrs*, following Burnet, speaks thus:—"Candlemas and Lent were now approaching, and the clergy and people were much divided with respect to the ceremonies usual at those times. By some injunctions in Henry's reign, it had been declared that fasting in Lent was only binding by a positive law. Wakes and Plough-Mondays were also suppressed, and hints were given that other customs, which were much abused, should be shortly done away. The [Burnet says *gross*] rabble loved these things, as matters of diversion, and thought divine worship without them would be but a dull business. But others looked on them as relics of heathenism, and thought they did not become the gravity and simplicity of the Christian religion." We doubt much that the customs thus alluded to were abused, at least to any great extent. But allowing they were abused, why not endeavour to *remove* the *abuse*, and not *abolish* the *custom*. Why deprive the people of their diversions, which had been so long standing, and afforded mirth and recreation to lighten labour and poverty? The answer is obvious. The retention of the customs would have reminded the people of the old religion, and of the sad changes which had been made by the lamentable plans of the reformers, and therefore it was deemed best to do away with the innocent enjoyments, as well as with the more solemn religious rites, which the Catholics had introduced to remind man of his Maker, and cheer him in his pilgrimage through life. Next followed a general order for the removal of all

images out of the churches, and stripping the sacred edifices of all unnecessary furniture. To this species of robbery bishop Hooper contributed largely by his doctrine. This reforming prelate was much displeased at the word *altar*, as well as the situation of it. He therefore exerted himself to have all the altars removed, and a *table* to be placed in the middle of the chancel. Such a scheme was very serviceable to those who had cast their eyes on the rich decorations which adorned the Catholic cathedrals and churches. The pretence was the superstitions and abuses occasioned by the use of images, &c., but the real design was that of plunder. Notwithstanding the vast treasure obtained by the confiscation of the chantries, colleges, &c., the king's exchequer was in an empty condition, and it was thought to replenish it by seizing the images, vestments, jewels, crosses, and other costly utensils and ornaments of the church. Commissioners were accordingly appointed to secure the delivery of these spoils for the king's use. But, writes Doctor Heylin,—“In all great fairs and markets there are some forestallers, who get the best pennyworth themselves, and suffer not the richest and most gainful commodities to be openly sold. And so it fared also in the present business, there being some who were as much beforehand with the king's commissioners in embezzling the said plate, jewels, and other furnitures, as the commissioners did intend to be with the king, in keeping all or most part unto themselves. For when the commissioners came to execute their powers in their different circuits, they neither could discover all, or recover much of that which had been purloined; some things being utterly embezzled by persons not responsible; in which case the king as well as the commissioners was to lose his right; but more concealed by persons not detectable, who had so cunningly carried the stealth, that there was no tracing of their footsteps. And some there were, who, being known to have such goods in their possession, conceived themselves too great to be called in question; connived at willingly by those who were but their equals, and either were or meant to be offenders in the

very same kind. So that although some profit was thereby raised to the king's exchequer, yet the far greatest part of the prey came to other hands: insomuch that many private men's parlours were hung with altar cloths, their tables and beds covered with copes, instead of carpets and coverlits; and many made carousing cups of the sacred chalices, as once Belshazzar celebrated his drunken feast in the sanctified vessels of the Temple. It was a sorry house, and not worth the naming, which had not somewhat of this furniture in it, though it were only a fair large cushion made of a cope or altar cloth, to adorn their windows, or make their chairs appear to have somewhat in them of a *chair of state*. Yet how contemptible were these trappings in comparison of those vast sums of money, which were made of jewels, plate, and cloth of tissue, either conveyed beyond the seas, or sold at home, and good lands purchased with the money; nothing the more blessed to the posterity of them that bought them, for being purchased with the consecrated treasures of so many temples." Mr. Collier, speaking of the same depredations, says:—"This order for undressing churches was, it seems, represented to the king [as Burnet relates the fact] as an inoffensive expedient, and only calling for the superfluous plate, and other goods that lay in churches, more for pomp than for use. But those who called these things superfluous, and shewed so slender a regard for the honour of religion, were none of the best reformers. Had these people governed in the minority of Josiah, as they did in this of Edward VI., they would, in all likelihood, have retrenched the expense of the Mosaic institution, and served God at a more frugal rate. They would have disfurnished the Temple of most of the gold plate, carried off the unnecessary magnificence, and left but little plunder for Nebuchadnezzar."

While these nefarious practices were going on among the factious lay *reformers*, Cranmer and his apostate bishops were engaged in forming a *new liturgy*, or office for the *new church about to be established by law*, but now supported by the power and authority of the crown. Previous however to



this measure, Cranmer had published a catechism, "for the singular profit and instruction of children and young people;" and it is well deserving notice, indeed it is a thing not to be forgotten, that in this very catechism, Cranmer comprises the prohibition of false gods and of images under *one* commandment, as is the case with the Catholic catechism, and teaches that in the communion are received with the bodily mouth THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST; inculcates, in strong terms, the advantages of *confession* and *absolution*, and attributes the origin of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to Christ, in a manner which seems to do away with his former opinion on the same subject. Now, however, the doctrine was to be *changed*, and some new method was to be devised, with a view to consummate the separation of the kingdom from the mother and mistress of all Christian churches. The *Book of Martyrs* says: "The first step that was now taken was to make a new office for the communion, that is, the distribution of the sacrament, for the office of consecration was not at this time touched. In the exhortation, auricular confession to a priest is left free to be done or omitted, and all were required not to judge one another in that matter. There was also a denunciation made, requiring impenitent sinners to withdraw. The bread was to be still of the same form as that formerly used. In the distribution it was said, 'The body of our Lord, &c., preserve thy body; and the blood of our Lord, &c., preserve thy soul.' This was printed, with a proclamation, requiring all to receive it with such reverence and uniformity as might encourage the king to proceed further, and not to run to other things before the king gave direction, assuring the people of his earnest zeal to set forth godly orders; and therefore it was hoped they would wait for it: the books were sent all over England, and the clergy were appointed to administer the communion at the following Easter according to them."

We have now arrived at a most interesting period of the progress of the *Reformation*, as it is called, and we beg the reader's particular attention to it. It has been shewn that

Cranmer in his catechism admitted the real presence of Christ in the blessed sacrament, as the law-established church catechism now does, though the *law* compels all candidates for civil and ecclesiastical office to *swear* that He is *not* present, and that the doctrine is damnable, though the church-by-*law* teaches it. Such is the incongruity of the dabblers in error under the mask of truth. Well, we are told that the *first step* in this work of innovation was to make a *new* office for the communion, which was only to affect the distribution of the sacrament, the office of the *consecration*, which is the essential part of the ceremony, remaining untouched. Still, in the *distribution* of the sacrament, the words THE BODY and THE BLOOD of our Lord, which words imply the *real presence* of Christ, and had *always* been used by the Catholic church, as they *now* are, were retained, because it was considered too imprudent to abolish them precipitately, in consequence of the well-known doctrine of the Catholic church on that head, and the disposition of the people, who were accurately acquainted with the faith and discipline of their creed, notwithstanding the representations of Burnet and his followers that they were ignorant and demoralized. As an instance of this fact, the Catholic clergy were willing to abide by PUBLIC OPINION, but the reformers, who preached up evangelical liberty, would not consent to leave their cause to argument and persuasion, but were resolved to cram their *new* schemes and opinions down the people's throats by *main force*. So long as the reformers proceeded no farther than ceremony and discipline, the lukewarm adherents to the Catholic faith slumbered at their posts; but when it was found that there was a design to attack the church both in doctrine and discipline, they began to arouse themselves from their apathy, and published several books in defence of the old religion, and challenged the opposite party to try the cause by disputation. "But," says Collier, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii, b. 4, p. 228, "the court, who, it is thought, had something farther than religion in view, did not think it advisable to venture the cause upon disputation, and

rely wholly upon arguments. They might be apprehensive, that, unless the disagreement between Rome and England was carried on to a wider distance, the breach might possibly be closed, and that such an union might prove unfriendly to their church estates. On the other hand, they were not assured whether any farther alterations in doctrine and worship would be well received. The minority of the prince was a circumstance of disadvantage : and how far the people would be passive under a new face of things was not easy to conjecture. To guard against the worst, it was thought fit to be furnished *with forces*, to *awe* the opposite party and prevent them from giving disturbance. And as an army was a seasonable provision, they wanted not a colour to raise it. A marriage (as has been observed) was agreed, in the late reign, between the young queen of Scotland and the present king ; but the Scots failed in their articles. The protector and council, therefore, resolved to bring them to reason. For this purpose men were levied, a fleet equipped, and the veteran troops of Boulogne and Calais embarked for England. The protector likewise had several regiments of Walloons and Germans in his pay : not that he had a better opinion of their courage, but because he might believe them more ready to execute any harsh service at home, if occasion required."

So, then, the preaching of the *new* doctrines was to be backed by an army, and that army too composed in part of FOREIGN TROOPS, of German mercenaries ! What would the Catholic people of England have said to this gross violation of their constitutional rights and national honour and freedom ? What can the liberal Protestant of the present day say in defence of his creed, which is here shewn to have been advanced, not by the power of miracles and the eloquence of reason, as the Catholic faith was planted in every part of the globe, but by the force of war, and the terror of bloodshed and rapine ? By these unhallowed and unlawful means where the people terrified into a tacit acquiescence of the projected changes, and a commission was accordingly

appointed in the year 1548, by the protector and council, consisting of certain bishops and divines, to draw up a *new* form of prayer or liturgy, a new ordinal, with a collection of articles, canons, and homilies, which were *intended* as a STANDARD, both for doctrine and discipline. But futile is the work of man in raising a standard to guide the conscience of his fellow men, as we shall see in the progress of this pretended Reformation of religion. The Catholic rests his faith on God alone, from whom it is derived, and, like Him, is immutable and indivisible. The Catholic can trace the finger of God sustaining his church through all the vicissitudes of earthly establishments, firm and erect like a citadel upon a rock, defying the waste of time or the assaults of adversaries ; while the plans of the reformers to erect a standard of uniformity were no sooner attempted than they were dispersed like sand before the wind, and scattered into thousands of discordant sects, each alike claiming the golden talisman of TRUTH, but all immersed in the slough of error. Of the articles of faith there were *forty-two* in number, and though pretended to have been drawn up under the influence of the Holy Ghost, yet under the popeship of queen Bess, they were reduced to *thirty-nine*, and blasphemously imputed to the same divine oracle of Truth, though they were well known to have been the work of unprincipled men. As to the liturgy in English, it was a selection from the *Missal*, in which the collects, epistles, and gospels were preserved, and are the same as are now used by the Catholic church, which has not varied in her service ; and even the essential part, relating to the great sacrifice of the mass, was not then omitted, though it has subsequently been erased. When this precious work was completed, it was some months before it obtained a legal establishment, and in the mean time many of the bishops and clergy continued to make use of the ancient liturgy in Latin. Others made use of it according to their own whims and pleasure. Some were for both forms, and some for neither. In a word, the flood-gates of discord were let open, and all was endless confusion. Collier

says, that "some censured this provision of a common prayer, because it is said to have been composed by *one uniform consent*, and yet *four* of the bishops who were in the committee for drawing it up, *protested against the bill*. These were the bishops of Norwich, Hereford, Chichester, and Westminster." The latter bishopric was afterwards abolished by the king's letters patent. Here then we have a *lie* set forth, and this book too was specified in the act of parliament to have been carried on *with the aid of the Holy Ghost*.

Of this work Burnet thus speaks :—"It was now resolved to have a liturgy, which should bring the worship to a proper mean between the pomp of superstition and naked simplicity. It was resolved to change nothing merely in opposition to received practices, but rather (in imitation of what Christ did in the institution of the two sacraments of the gospel, that consisted of rites used among the Jews, but sanctified by him to higher purposes) to comply with what had been formerly in use, as much as was possible, thereby to gain the people. All the consecrations of water, salt, &c., in the church of Rome, being relics of heathenism, were laid aside. The absolutions on account of the merits of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, the sprinklings of water, fastings, and pilgrimages, with many other things, and the absolution given to dead bodies, were looked upon as gross impostures, tending to make the world think that the priests had the keys of heaven in their hands, and could carry people thither on easier terms than the gospel prescribes. This induced the people to purchase their favour, especially when they were dying; so that, as their fears were then heightened, there was no other way left them, in the conclusion of an ill life, to die with any hopes of eternal happiness, but as they bargained with their priests: all this was now rejected." Here we are told that it was resolved to *change nothing*, but to comply with what had been *formerly in use*, as much as possible, *thereby to gain the people*. Out upon thee, hypocrite! thou must have known that the way adopted by these reformers to gain the people, was by the force of military coercion and penal laws! But what



shall we say to the base insinuation that the people were, in those times, induced to *purchase* the favour of the priests? This, we suppose, is thrown in as a set-off to hide the selfish disposition of the reformed clergy, of whom Burnet was one, in seizing the tithes to themselves, and grinding the people as much as they could, instead of gaining their favour. The priests were, at that time, as the Catholic clergy are now, and always have been, the fathers of the people and the supporters of the poor: they were the shepherds of their flocks, and not the shearers of them, like the reformed clergy. But though it "was resolved to change nothing, merely in opposition to received practices, but rather to comply with what had been formerly in use," it appears that the reformers were somewhat like the old man in the fable, in trying to please everybody they pleased nobody, for it must have been self-evident that the Catholics would not be satisfied with the changes, moderate as they are represented to have been; and as to the reformers themselves, Burnet says, "When the book came before the public, several things were censured: as particularly the frequent use of the cross, and anointing. The former was at first used as the badge of a crucified Saviour, but was much corrupted by the priests in after ages, so that it was at length believed to have a virtue for driving away evil spirits, and preserving one from dangers; and acquired a kind of sacramental character, entirely unfounded in scripture or reason; but the using it as a ceremony, expressing the believing in a crucified Saviour, could imply no superstition." This representation may suit Mr. Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Sarum, and the modern editors of the *Book of Martyrs*, but Catholics have better authority than this hireling historian, for retaining and using this glorious and holy emblem of our redemption, wrought by a God-man. Why were not the "after ages" specified when the use of this badge was *first* corrupted by the priests? Why not *name* the express time when the belief that the use of this badge drove evil spirits from us, and preserved one from dangers, was first introduced? We have shewn, in our first volume of this work, that

Constantine the Great obtained a splendid victory over his enemy in arms under the banner of the cross, before he became a Christian, and which, he was told in a vision, would ensure him a triumph on adopting it. He afterwards embraced Christianity, and caused images of our Saviour and representations of the cross to be placed in the most conspicuous parts of Constantinople, viewing that sign as the defence and bulwark of his empire. But this was not the first time that the sign of the cross was used by Christians, the custom being coeval with Christianity itself. Tertullian, who lived in the second century, writes :— “ Whenever we move ; when we enter and go out ; in dressing and washing ; at table ; when we retire to rest ; during conversation—we impress on our foreheads the sign of the cross. Should you ask for the scripture authority for this and suchlike practices, I answer there is none ; but there is tradition that authorizes it, custom that confirms it, submission that observes it.”—*De Corona Mil.* c. iii. iv. p. 289. Lactantius, a father of the Latin church, in the fourth century, says :— “ As Christ, whilst he lived amongst men, put the devils to flight by his word, and restored those to their senses whom these evil spirits had possessed : so now, his followers, in the name of their master, and by the sign of his passion, exercise the same dominion over them. The proof is easy. When the idolaters sacrifice to their gods, they cannot proceed if, a Christian being present, he sign his forehead with the cross ; nor can the diviner give his responses. This has often been the cause of the persecutions we have undergone. And, in like manner, when some masters were on the point of sacrificing in the presence of their Christian servants, the latter, by making the sign of the cross on the forehead, so frightened away the gods, that nothing could be collected from the bowels of the victims.”—*Divin. Instit.* l. 4. c. xxvii. p. 225. St. Athanasius, of the Greek church, in the same century, says :— “ In the midst of the incantations of the devils only let the sign of the cross, which the gentiles ridicule, be used ; let Christ be merely named, the devils will be instantly put to flight, the oracles be silent, and all the arts of magic reduced to nothing.”—*De*

*Incarnat.* t. i. p. 89. And St. John Chrysostom, of the same church and the same age, who, for his profound learning and eloquence, obtained the surname of *Chrysostom*, which signifies *Golden Mouth*, thus speaks of this ceremony:—“Let no one be ashamed of these symbols of our salvation, of these signs. The passion of our Lord is the origin, is the fountain of that happiness, by which we live, and are. With a joyous heart, as if it were a crown, let us carry about with us the cross of Christ. For by it is consummated whatever pertains to our salvation. When we are baptized, the cross of Christ is there; and also, when we partake of the most holy food of the eucharist, and in every other sacred exercise. Wherefore, let us, with earnestness, impress this cross on our houses, and on our walls, and our windows, on our foreheads also, and on our breasts. It is the sign of our salvation, of our common liberty, of the meekness and humility of our Lord. As often then as you sign yourself, pass over in your mind the general concern of the cross, suppress all the workings of anger and the other passions, and fortify your breast with firmness. It should be made not only on the body, but with great confidence on the mind. If it be done in this manner, not one of the wicked spirits, when he sees the spear that inflicted the deadly wound, will dare to assail you.”—*Homil. iv. in Matt. c. xvi.* pp. 594, 595. We could produce many other fathers of this age in favour of the use of this sign of our redemption, but enough has been said to shew the spirit which induced the reformers to hate it, and Gilbert Burnet to become their apologist.

The modern editors, selecting from Burnet, go on to tell their readers, that “the Protestant religion now appeared almost *ruined* in Germany, and *this* made the reformers *turn their eyes to England*. Calvin wrote to the protector, and pressed him to go on to a *more complete Reformation*, and that *prayers for the dead*, the chrism, and *extreme unction*, might *be laid aside*. He desired him to trust in God, and go on, and wished there *were more preaching*, and in a *more lively way* than he heard was then in England: but above

all things he prayed him TO SUPPRESS THAT IMPIETY AND PROFANITY that, as he heard, ABOUNDED IN THE NATION." Oh Lord ! what, had the pious John Calvin, who had himself been branded on the shoulder for a most detestable crime, learned that *impiety* and *profanity* abounded in England ? And did he, most *apostolic* man, really exhort the *saintly* and *devout* reformer, Somerset, lord protector, to suppress that burning shame of the Reformation, immorality of the grossest nature ? What a precious change to godliness and pure doctrine that must have been, which produced such a general scene of wickedness and dissoluteness of manners as overflowed those countries where the Reformation, as it is improperly termed, took root ! But we need not wonder at such deplorable depravity, when we look at the character of the principal movers in those scenes. Burnet tells us, but the modern editors thought proper to suppress this information, that, " while these changes were under consideration, there were great heats everywhere, and a great contradiction among the pulpits : some commending all the old customs, and others inveighing as much against them ; so the power of granting licences to preach was taken from the bishops, and restrained only to the king and the archbishops ; yet even that did not prove an effectual restraint. So a proclamation was set out, restraining all preaching, till the order, which was then in the hands of the bishops, should be finished ; and instead of hearing sermons, all were required to apply themselves to prayer, for a blessing on that which was then a preparing, and to content themselves in the meanwhile with the homilies." What a pretty description is this of the " Progress of the Reformation," under the evangelical apostles in the young pope Edward's time. Here we have a complete repetition of Babel-building confusion, till the *civil* power was exerted to obtain silence, and the teachers of—what shall we say ?—to say *religion*, would be to apply a wrong term—the teachers of corrupt doctrine and human notions were muzzled by a state proclamation. But what else was to be expected from such a beginning ? Those who pretended to reform the sup-

posed errors and abuses in the Catholic church, which, as we have shewn, was founded by a divine Architect, had no lawful commission to interfere in her regulations, and consequently, not being invested with a divine commission, they had not the least power to restrain conscience or command obedience. Hence, it followed that those who set up for *reformers* of the church of Rome, were themselves taxed as infected with error by others who set up for reformers of the *new* church of England and her liturgy : these latter reformers were, in their turn, beset by other reformers, and thus the work of reform has been going on among the children of the Reformation, so called, until faith has been frittered away and infidelity has taken its place. In the meanwhile, the Catholic church, securely seated on her imperishable foundation, has, by the aid of her missionaries, afforded all the succour in her power to those who seek her help, and thousands have been rescued from the gulf of perdition, by entering the doors of her stately edifice and conforming to her divine precepts.

We must now notice another curious transaction of these reformers. The modern editors, copying from Burnet, say :—“ Another act was also passed respecting *fasting*, declaring, ‘ that though all days and meats were in themselves alike, yet fasting, being a great help to virtue, and to the subduing the body to the mind, it was enacted, that Lent, and all Fridays and Saturdays, and Ember-days, should be *fish-days*, under *several penalties*, excepting the weak, or *those that had the king’s licence*.’ Christ had told his disciples, that when he was taken from them, they should fast ; so in the primitive church they fasted before Easter ; but the same number of days was not observed in all places ; afterwards, other rules and days were established ; but St. Austin complained, that many in his time placed all their religion in observing them. *Fast-days are turned to a mockery in the church of Rome*, in which they dine on fish exquisitely drest, and drink wine.” If fast-days be turned to a mockery in the church of Rome, we have here the avowal of the modern editors and Burnet, that Christ commanded *his* disciples to



*fast*; and yet the modern editors and their compeers, in hatred to Popery, condemn fasting as a superstitious practice. How far it is a mockery in the church of Rome we will say no more than, if the authors of this gross falsehood would but spend one week of Lent according to the discipline of the Catholic church, they would soon become convinced of the injustice they have done her, and acknowledge themselves to be what we tell them they are—brazen, frontless liars. This act was abolished by queen Mary, but was renewed in the fifth year of Elizabeth, not, however, for the purpose of “subduing the body to the mind;” not because it was “a great help to virtue;” not because Christ had told his disciples that they should fast; but because it was deemed of *political* importance, to provide for the increase of the navy. It was, therefore, enacted by the parliament of her lady-popeship, that all Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays throughout the year, should be observed as *fast-days*, under a penalty of forty shillings for each offence, one third part of which was to go to the queen, one to the informer, and the other to the poor of the parish. This act, we believe, is still unrepealed, but not enforced. But since it is allowed that *fasting* is not only of benefit to the mind, but a help to virtue, why are the Catholics the only class of religionists in England that follow this admitted apostolic practice? And why do Protestants revile and reproach them for it, when their own church, in her infancy, attempted to enforce the custom on them by civil pains and penalties? See again, too, that power was given to the king, as head of the new church, to dispense with the obligations of this law, yet Protestants object to a similar power being held by the pope and the prelates of the Catholic church. But it is like all the proceedings of the disciples of error, who have no other rules than their own visionary notions, which are drifted to and fro by every wind that blows from the different points of the compass.

We have seen that *foreign troops* were brought over by the lord protector, to awe the people into an acquiescence of

the changes then meditated in the religion of the country and of Christendom. It was now thought necessary to introduce *foreign doctors* in religion, to reform what had already undergone reform. Peter Martyr Vermilli, an Italian canon, Martin Regular Bucer, a black friar, and Bernardin Ochin, a capuchin, were brought over by Cranmer to assist in the great work the latter and the protector had at heart. As the tree is known by its fruit, we may as well give the reader some slight sketch of the character of these apostles of the Reformation. They were all bound by the solemn vows of celibacy to lead a continent life, but they took upon themselves to dispense with these vows, and Peter brought over with him a woman, a nun, bound like himself to a life of chastity, whom he called his wife. Martin Bucer likewise broke through his solemn vows by a sacrilegious marriage; he was also chiefly instrumental in procuring the scandalous license which granted to the landgrave of Hesse the privilege of having two living wives at once. He imposed upon Luther and others by shameful equivocations concerning the blessed sacrament, and was the first inventor of that contradictory system of a real presence of a thing really absent, that is, of receiving verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, though they are not verily and indeed there. Bernardin was not content with one wife, but wrote a book in defence of polygamy, and at length proceeded so far as to deny the blessed Trinity. Such were the auxiliaries introduced by Cranmer to complete the work of deformation which he had begun.

In the first liturgy, drawn up in the year 1548, which we have before spoken of, the consecration of the sacrifice of the Eucharist was retained, with the prayer, *With thy Holy Spirit vouchsafe to ble+ss and sanc+tify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be made unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, &c.* This prayer was soon found to savour too much of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and therefore it was subsequently erased. The liturgy also retained something of

prayer for the dead: for at funerals, *they recommended the soul departed to God's mercy*, and as Catholics now do, they *prayed that his sins might be pardoned*. This prayer savoured of the primitive doctrine of purgatory, and reminded the people too much of the despoiled chantries; therefore it must now be banished from that liturgy that was said to have been compiled by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The sacrament of confirmation was turned into a catechism to renew baptismal vows, though the fathers, who received it from the apostles of Christ, say not one word of a catechism. Here are a few examples. St. Cyprian, who lived in the third century, and was a doctor of the Latin church, writes thus:—"It is moreover necessary, that he who has been baptized, should be anointed, in order that, having received the chrism, that is, the unction, he may be the anointed of God, and possess the grace of Christ."—*Ep.* lxx. p. 190. "They who had believed in Samaria (Acts, vii.), had believed with a true faith, and were baptized in the one church by Philip, whom the apostles have sent. And, therefore, because their baptism was legitimate, it was not to be repeated. That alone which was wanting, was supplied by Peter and John; that by prayer and the imposition of hands, they might receive the Holy Ghost. The same thing is now done by us, when they who have been baptized in the church are presented to the bishops, that by our prayer and the imposition of hands, they may receive the divine spirit, and be perfected by the seal of the Lord."—*Ep.* lxxiii. p. 202. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in the same age, says:—"To you, when you came out from the font, was given the chrism, which is the image of that with which Christ was anointed, that is, the Holy Spirit. Take care that you think it not mere ointment, with which the forehead and your bodily senses are symbolically anointed; the body, indeed, is anointed with that visible chrism, but the soul is sanctified by the Holy Spirit."—*Cat. Myst.* iii. n. 1, 3, pp. 289, 290. "As Christ, after his baptism and the coming of the Divine Spirit, went out to battle, and conquered the enemy; so you,

after baptism and the mystical chrism, clothed in the arms of the same Spirit, are opposed to him and surmount his attacks.”—*Ibid.* p. 290. St. Ambrose, likewise, at the same period, says:—“Because thou hast received the spiritual seal, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and piety, the spirit of holy fear; keep what thou hast received. God the Father has sealed thee; Christ the Lord has confirmed thee, and has *given the pledge of the Spirit in thy heart*, (2 Cor. i. 22.) as thou hast learned from the apostle.”—*De Initand.* c. vii. t. iv. p. 349. And St. Jerom, the great and learned compiler of the bible, speaking to a schismatic, says:—“You cannot be ignorant, that it is the practice in the church to impose hands on those that have been baptized, and to invoke the Holy Spirit. Where, you ask, is it written? In the Acts of the Apostles; and although there were no authority of scripture, the consent of the whole world on this point must be received as law.” To this St. Jerom thus assents: “I admit this to be the practice of the church, that when, in remote places, any have been baptized by the priests or deacons, the bishop goes to them, and having invoked the Holy Spirit, lays his hands on them.”—*Dial. adv. Lucif.* t. i. p. 615. Thus, then, it is manifest that confirmation was deemed by the primitive fathers and Christians a sacrament of divine institution, but it was considered by the reformers as too papistical, and therefore must be altered.

Another alteration was in the sacrament of extreme unction. The visitation of the sick was enjoined; but the use of the holy oil, though spoken of by St. James in the New Testament, must be laid aside, under pretence that it was not heard of till the twelfth century. To enable our readers to decide this point, we will here lay before them, as we have done on the ceremony of the cross and the sacrament of confirmation, the sentiments of some of the holy fathers, who all, observe, ground their doctrine on the words of St. James and the practice of the apostles. It is stated in St. Mark, vi. 12, 13,

that, "*going forth, they preached that men should do penance, and they cast out many devils, and ANOINTED WITH OIL many that were SICK, and healed them.*" To this practice of the disciples of Christ, during his ministry on earth, St. James undoubtedly refers when he says, in his epistle:— "*Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church,*" &c. Victor of Antioch, a priest of that city, who flourished about the close of the fourth century, has left us a commentary on St. Mark's gospel, in which he says:— "*St. Mark mentions (vi. 13.) that the anointing with oil was anciently used; with whom St. James agrees when he says: Is any one sick among you? &c. (v. 14.) Oil relieves lassitude, and is the source of light and gladness; the anointing with oil, therefore, denotes mercy from God, the cure of sickness, and the illumination of the heart.*" *Bibl. PP. Max. T. iv. p. 381.* St. John Chrysostom speaks also in the same terms. He says:— "*To our parents we are indebted for the present life; to the ministers of God for the life to come. But they cannot ward off death from their children, nor even sickness; while the latter, not unfrequently, save the soul labouring at the point of death; inflicting on some a lighter punishment; and preventing others from being lost; not by instruction only and admonition, but by the defence of prayer. For they have obtained a power, not in baptism only, but of forgiving the sins which we afterwards commit. Is any man sick among you? says St. James, Let him bring in the priests of the church,*" &c. *L. iii. de Sacerdot. c. 6. t. iv. p. 31.* Pope Innocent I. in reply to certain questions put to him by Decentius, an Italian bishop, remarks:— "*You cite the words of St. James, Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church,*" &c. This passage, doubtless, is to be understood of the sick among the faithful, who may be anointed with the holy chrism, which, when consecrated by the bishop, not only priests, but all Christians, may use in anointing themselves and others in cases of necessity. It is idle to make any question about bishops, since the practice is allowed to priests. For there-



fore are priests mentioned, on account of the many occupations in which bishops are engaged, which may hinder them from attending the sick. When the bishop can, or is inclined to attend, he may give his blessing, and anoint with that chrism, which it was his office to consecrate." *Ep. ad Decent. Conc. Gen. t. ii. pp. 1247, 1248.* St. Augustin too holds the same doctrine. "As often," he says, "as sickness happens, the sick man should receive the body and blood of Christ, and then anoint his body, in order to comply with the words of the apostle, *Is any man sick among you? &c.* Consider, brethren, that he who, in his sickness, has recourse to the church, will deserve to obtain the restoration of his health, and the forgiveness of his sins." *Serm. ccxv. de Temp. t. x. p. 367.* We have thus established the ancient tenure of this doctrine, and we think common sense will decide that it is better to hold with a belief as old as Christianity itself, than to renounce it on the authority of such worthless characters as the prime movers of this new liturgy or bastard mass for the poor begulled and unhappy people of England.

It is now time for us to speak of the means used to establish this form of *prayer*, as it was called, and to make it a standard of church service for the people of England. It was, as we have before stated, first drawn up in the year 1548, and being put forth without any due authority, gave rise to much confusion, some using it and some deriding it, which caused a proclamation to be issued in the king's name on the 24th of June, 1549, ordering that no one in future should, so much as *in private*, make use of any other liturgy, and that the mass in Latin should be laid aside. This was certainly a pretty stretch of power on the part of these evangelical liberty-men, to presume to dictate and regulate the *private* devotions of the people. However, this proclamation was found inefficient, and it was therefore followed by an *Act of Parliament*, called the *Uniformity Act*, which imposed severe penalties on those who had the temerity to refuse compliance with the orders of the new religion makers.

Every clergyman not making use of it, in the church service, was, for the first offence, to suffer half-a-year's imprisonment, and forfeit half-a-year's profits of his benefice; for the second offence he was to be deprived *ipso facto*, and lose all his spiritual emoluments; and for the third, to be imprisoned for life. Persons absenting themselves from church, or attempting to bring the new liturgy into contempt, were also subjected to fine and imprisonment. Thus stood the common prayer of the new church of England, as by law established, till it was revised and altered in the year 1552, just *three* years after its formation. The reign of Mary rendered it nugatory, but her successor Elizabeth, on assuming the supreme headship of the church, had it revised and altered again in 1559. It was a *third* time altered under James I., in 1603; and a *fourth* time under Charles II., in 1662. Several alterations were made at each of those times to please those who *dissented* from the established church, but equally hated Popery, and with a view to secure unity; but the more such uniformity was attempted, the further were the meddlers from the mark, since each successive age, has proved more prolific in sectarianism than the preceding one. There was an attempt made in 1669, the year after that era, termed "the glorious Revolution," from whence the bigotted favourists date the constitution of England to be essentially Protestant, though it is well known to have been the work of Catholic hands; but the attempt failed, and though there has been and is now much diversity of opinion on the contents of this book, and many divines are anxious that it should be *again revised*, yet they one and all swear before ordination, that it containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God, that it may be lawfully used, and that they will use it, and none other. What consistent teachers to instruct and enlighten the most superiorly gifted people on the earth, as Protestant writers in modern times represent the English Protestants to be.

To secure a uniformity of doctrine and discipline, which had been so long preserved when the kingdom was Catholic,

without the aid of penal laws, another notable scheme was devised by these reformers, which further disclosed the regard they entertained for the freedom of conscience and the liberty of the subject. The church was now absorbed in the STATE, and the canon law established by the decrees of popes and councils, who were invested by the DIVINE POWER to watch over the faith and morals of mankind, became nugatory through the abolition of the pope's supremacy. It was therefore thought necessary that some code of ecclesiastical laws should be forthwith formed that would answer the purposes intended. Such a scheme was in preparation during Henry's reign, but his death retarded the completion of the project, and it was left to Edward's wise counsellors to reduce the plan to practice. Accordingly a commission of thirty-two persons, one half of them ecclesiastics, and the other half laymen, were appointed by the king's letters patent, who were ordered to finish their work in three years. The wording of these new laws, however, was left to a sub-committee of eight persons, at the head of whom was TOM CRANMER, who had sided with every administration since his appointment to the see at Canterbury, and pandered to the vices both of Henry and the lord protector Somerset. The entire collection of these ecclesiastical constitutions was completed in 1552, and consisted of fifty-one titles, besides an appendix *De Regulis Juris*. It was called *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticorum*, but the king happening to die soon after, prevented its becoming confirmed either by parliament or the convocation. Of the tenor of these constitutions the reader will be able to decide when he has read the following account of them from the pen of Dr. Lingard. Speaking of the compilation, the learned historian says:—

“ It commences with an exposition of the Catholic faith, and enacts the punishment of forfeiture and death against those who deny the Christian religion. It then regulates the proceedings in cases of heresy, the ceremony of abjuration, and the delivery of the obstinate heretic to the civil magistrate, that he may suffer death according to law. Blasphemy

subjects the offender to the same penalty. The marriages of minors, without the consent of their parents or guardians, and of all persons whomsoever, without the previous publication of banns, or the entire performance of the ceremony in the church according to the Book of Common Prayer, are pronounced of no effect. The seducer of a single woman is compelled to marry her, or to endow her with one-third of his fortune: or, if he have no fortune, to charge himself with the maintenance of their illegitimate offspring, and to suffer some additional and arbitrary punishment. Adultery is visited with imprisonment or transportation for life. In addition, if the offender be the wife, she forfeits her jointure, and all the advantages she might have derived from her marriage: if the husband, he returns to the wife her dower, and adds to it one half of his own fortune. But to a clergyman, in whom the enormity of the offence increases in proportion to the sanctity of his office, the penalty is more severe. He loses his benefice, and surrenders the whole of his estate, if he be married, to the unoffending party, for the support of her and her children; if unmarried, to the bishop, that it may be devoted to purposes of charity.

“Divorces are allowed not only for adultery, but for cruelty, long absence, and incompatibility of temper; and in all such cases the parties are permitted to marry again: but where one deserts the other, this indulgence is confined to the innocent person; the guilty is condemned to perpetual imprisonment. In cases of defamation, when from the destruction of papers or absence of witnesses, the truth cannot be discovered, the accused is permitted to clear his character by his oath, provided he can produce a competent number of compurgators, who shall swear that they give full credit to his assertion. Commutation of penance for money is conceded on particular occasions: the right of devising property by will is refused to married women, slaves, children under fourteen years of age, heretics, libellers, females of loose character, usurers, and convicts sentenced to death, or perpetual banishment or imprisonment: and excommunication

is asserted to cut off the offender from the society of the faithful, the protection of God, and the expectation of future happiness; and to consign him to everlasting punishment, and the tyranny of the devil."

We shall dismiss the minor transactions appertaining to religion, detailed in the modern *Book of Martyrs*, from Burnet's History, such as the disputes concerning the real presence, which we proved to demonstration in the first volume of this work, from the testimony of the fathers of the first five ages, was of apostolical belief, and conclude the theological part of the progress of the Reformation, with the following remarks from Bossuet's *History of the Variations*, shewing how the hatred of the people was raised by degrees against the Catholic doctrine, in which he furnishes a remarkable instance practised upon the young king himself. The modern editors unblushingly avow that *their* motive for profusely circulating this mass of lies, distortions, and misrepresentations, was to excite *hatred* and abhorrence against the (supposed) crimes and corruption of Popery and its professors. The reader will here see that the *same* spirit that influenced the ancient reformers to blacken and vilify the Catholic church and their institutions, now influences the modern exclusionists and admirers of Fox to follow the same uncharitable practices. Treating on the changes made on the doctrine of the blessed sacrament, the learned Bossuet says: "The cause of so irregular a proceeding, was the leading the people by motives of hatred, and not of reason. It was an easy matter to excite hatred against certain practices, whereof they concealed from the people the beginning and right use, especially when some abuses were interwoven with them: thus, it was easy to render priests odious who abused the mass for sordid gain: and hatred once inflamed against them, was by a thousand artifices insensibly turned against the mystery they celebrated, and even, as hath appeared, against the real presence, the foundation of it.

"The same was done with respect to images, and a French letter, which Mr. Burnet gives us, of Edward VI. to his uncle



the protector, makes it palpable. To exercise the young prince's style, his masters set him about collecting all the passages wherein God speaks against idols. 'In reading the holy scripture I was desirous,' said he, 'to note several places which forbid both *to adore and to make* any images, not only of strange gods, but also to form anything: thinking *to make it like to the majesty of God the Creator.*' In his credulous age he had simply believed what was told him, that Catholics made images, thinking 'they made them like to the majesty of God.' 'I am quite astonished,' proceeds he, (God himself and his Holy Spirit having so often forbidden it,) that so many people have dared to commit idolatry *by making and adoring images.*' He fixes the same hatred, as we see, on the *making*, as on the *adoring* them; and, according to the notions that were given to him, is in the right, since undoubtedly it is not lawful to *make* images with the thought of making something '*like to the majesty of the Creator.*' 'For,' as this prince adds, 'God cannot be seen in things that are material, but will be seen in his own works.' Thus was a young child deluded by them. His hatred was stirred up against pagan images, in which man pretends to represent the Deity: it was shewn him that God forbids to make such images: but they, not having as yet taken it into their heads to say, that it is unlawful to make such as ours, or unlawful to represent Jesus Christ and his saints, they took care to conceal from him that those of Catholics were not of this nature. A youth of ten or twelve years old could not discover it of himself: to make images odious to him in general and confusedly was enough for their purpose. Those of the church, though of a different order and design, passed in the lump: dazzled with the plausible reasoning and authority of his masters, everything was an idol to him; and the hatred he had conceived against idolatry was easily turned against the church.

"The people were not more cunning, and but too easy was it to animate them by the like artifices. After this, can the sudden progress of the Reformation be taken for a visible

miracle, the work of God's own hand? With what assurance could Mr. Burret say it; he, who has so thoroughly discovered to us the deep causes of this lamentable success? A prince blinded with inordinate passion, and condemned by the pope, sets men at work to exaggerate particular facts, some odious proceedings and abuses which the church herself condemned. All pulpits ring with satires against ignorant and scandalous priests, they are brought on the stage and made the subject of farce and comedy, insomuch that Mr. Burnet himself expresses his indignation at it. Under the authority of an infant king, and a protector violently addicted to Zuinglianism, invective and satire are carried to a still higher pitch. *The laity, that had long looked on their pastors with an evil eye*, greedily swallowed down the poisonous novelty. The difficulties in the mystery of the eucharist are removed, and the senses, instead of being kept under subjection, are flattered. Priests are set free from the obligation of continency; monks from all their vows; the whole world from the yoke of confession, wholesome indeed for the correction of vice, but burdensome to nature. A doctrine of greater liberty was preached up, 'and which,' as Mr. Burnet says, 'shewed a plain and simple way to the kingdom of heaven.' Laws so convenient met with but too ready a compliance. Of sixteen thousand ecclesiastics, who made up the body of the English clergy, we are assured by Mr. Burnet, that three parts renounced their celibacy in Edward's time, that is, in the space of five or six years; and good Protestants were made of these bad ecclesiastics, who thus renounced their vows. Thus were the clergy gained. As for the laity, the church revenues exposed to rapine became their prey. The vestry plate enriched the prince's exchequer: the shrine alone of St. Thomas of Canterbury, with the inestimable presents that had been sent to it from all parts, produced a royal treasure of immense sums of money. This was enough to degrade that holy martyr. He was attainted, that he might be pillaged, nor were the riches of his tomb the least of his crimes. In short, it was judged more expedient to plunder

the churches, than, conformable to the intention of the founders, to apply their patrimony to its right use. Where is the wonder, if the nobility, the clergy, and the people were so easily gained upon? Is it not rather a visible miracle that there remained a spark in Israel, and that all other kingdoms did not follow the example of England, Denmark, Sweden, and Germany, which were *reformed* by the same means? Amidst all these *reformations*, the only one that visibly made no progress was that of *manners*."

#### DISCONTENTS OF THE PEOPLE.

We have seen the change made by the reformers in the doctrine and discipline of the church; it is now time to see what effect this change had upon the general condition of the people and the public credit of the kingdom. Burnet, like all other writers who prostitute their talents for lucre by lying and deception, would fain persuade us that the Reformation was pleasing to the people. He tells us, at the commencement of his account of this reign, that "the people generally were crying out for a Reformation, despising the clergy, and *loving the new preachers*." This disposition however, it appears, did not, if it ever existed, last long, for he was obliged to acknowledge, in a subsequent part of his account, that the people grew discontented, and that rebellions took place in Devonshire and other parts. "About this time," he writes, "a rebellion broke out in many parts of England, partly arising from a jealousy in the commons against the nobility and gentry, who finding more advantage by the trade of wool than by that of corn, generally enclosed their grounds, and turned them to pasture, by which a great number of persons were thrown out of employment, and a general consternation was spread throughout the country. The other cause was the unquenched enmity of the Popish priests to the Reformation, and their endeavours to revive in the minds of the blinded multitude their former errors." Here we have a base attempt to disguise the real state of the case, by affixing part of the discontents to "the unquenched enmity of the

Popish priests," whereas it is incontrovertible that the commotions originated in the cruel oppressions of the reformers towards the commonalty. Religion was undoubtedly mixed up with the grievances of the people, but it ought not to surprise any one that the people should bear an affection towards a system of religion under which they had been so happy, and a dislike towards that which had brought with it so many ills, and rendered their situation so miserable and comfortless. The disturbances arose out of the new order of things, by which mischievous inroads had been made in the constitution of the country, the currency was depreciated, and a proportionate advance in all saleable commodities followed in consequence. The value of land rose with the value of its produce, and the rents of farms had been doubled, and in several instances trebled. Had the wages of the labourer kept pace with the advance of prices, little or no difference would have been occasioned. But the demand for labour, in consequence of the land being in new hands, was lessened, and the wages were reduced instead of being advanced. This state of things we have in part witnessed within the last thirty years, owing to the restrictions which were placed upon the bank of England, whereby it was prevented from paying its notes in gold, and the country being thus deluged with paper money, the regular currency became depreciated, so that prices advanced to the injury of labour, and discontents succeeded as in the time of Edward. In Catholic times, particularly on the estates of the monks and clergy, considerable portions of the land were allotted to the common use of the labourers and poor inhabitants; by which careful economy a great degree of comfort was afforded them, and pauperism was utterly unknown in England. Now, however, the new landlords, after having robbed the clergy of their abbey lands and the poor of their patrimony, conceived that these waste lands would add to their advantage, and wholly disregarding the wants of their indigent neighbours, began to inclose the commons, and thus cut off every hope of the poor for a subsistence. Grazing, too, was found much more profitable than

growing corn, and to such an extent was this new mode of farming carried, that it was stated in a proclamation issued by the king, that many villages, in which 100 or 200 people had lived, were now entirely destroyed; that one shepherd now dwelt where industrious families dwelt before; and that the realm is wasted by "bringing arable grounds into pasture, and letting houses, whole families, and copyholds, to fall down, decay, and be waste." Under such a state of things, it could not be expected that men would remain quiet, especially as we have seen that the projectors of the new liturgy so far anticipated resistance to their innovations, that they caused *foreign* mercenary troops to be brought into the country. The people *felt* their own miseries, and they saw that the new holders of the land did not treat them with the same kindness as the former proprietors: it was natural therefore that they should couple their own grievances with the innovations of religion. They found their own resources diminished, and were now compelled to listen to a dull, cold, inanimate form of worship, instead of those soul-inspiring ceremonies they had been accustomed to from their very infancy. Thus goaded nearly to madness, the people rose almost simultaneously in the counties of Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Wilts, Hampshire, Gloucester, Somerset, Berks, Warwick, Leicester, Worcester, Hertford, Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, and Cornwall. In Wiltshire, Sir William Herbert put himself at the head of a body of troops, dispersed the insurgents, and executed martial law on the ringleaders. In the other countries tranquillity was partially restored by the exertions of the resident gentry and the moderate among the yeomanry. In Norfolk, Cornwall, and Devon, the risings assumed the most alarming appearance, and threatened defiance to the government. In general, however, the insurgents acted without concert and without competent leaders; still the issue would have been doubtful, had not the reformers availed themselves of the aid of FOREIGN TROOPS to cut down and massacre Englishmen contending for their rights. Protestant reader, bear in mind, and never let it slip your



memory, this great and important fact, that the Reformation in religion in England, was crammed down the throats of the people by FOREIGN BAYONETS.

When the new liturgy was read the first time in the church of Samford Courteney, in Devonshire, on Whit Sunday, the people compelled the clergyman the next day to restore the ancient service. This act was the signal for a general insurrection, and in a few days the insurgents numbered ten thousand men, headed by Humphrey Arundel, governor of St. Michael's Mount. With the troops sent to oppose them were three preachers, named Gregory, Reynolds, and Coverdale, who received *a license from the king to declare the word of God to the people*; but these missionaries did not feel disposed to run the risk of martyrdom, and the general not having confidence in their eloquence, entered into a negotiation with the malcontents. The latter made fifteen demands, which they afterwards reduced to eight, requiring the restoration of the ancient service, the introduction of cardinal Pole into the council, and the re-establishment of two abbeys at least in every county. Tom Cranmer composed a long reply to the former, and the king answered the latter by a proclamation, couched in no very gracious language. Arundel in the mean time attempted to take the city of Exeter, by laying siege to it, but without success, as he was bravely resisted by the inhabitants. After a siege of forty days, lord Gray arrived with a reinforcement of *German* horse and *Italian* arquebusiers, who drove the insurgents from the town, and eventually defeated them. During these disturbances martial law, we are told, was executed in every part of the kingdom. Sir Anthony Kyngstone, provost of the Western army, is stated by Speed and Hayward to have distinguished himself by the promptitude of his decisions and the pleasantry with which he accompanied them. Having dined with the mayor of Bodmin, writes Dr. Lingard, he asked him if the gallows were sufficiently strong? The mayor replied he thought so. "Then," said Kyngstone, "go up and try;" and hanged him without further ceremony.

On another occasion, having received information against a miller, he proceeded to the mill, and not finding the master at home, ordered the servant to the gallows, bidding him be content, for it was the best service which he had ever rendered to his master. The reader, we have no doubt, is disgusted with such pleasantry, and shudders at the callousness of the heart that could indulge in them, though acting in defence of the enlightened Protestant religion. Let us then hear no more of Popish cruelties. The changes have been rung till the people are almost deafened with the barbarous deeds of Jefferies and Kirk, in Monmouth's rebellion against James II., who happened to be a Catholic prince, though in this case the judge and colonel were both Protestants.

In Norfolk the insurrection assumed a more formidable appearance. It commenced at Attleborough, on the 20th of June, 1549, according to Dr. Heylin, but the insurgents did not begin to appear in considerable numbers until the 6th of July following, when the people flocked from all the surrounding parishes to join them, and they were headed by one Kett, a tanner, of Wymondham, a town about six miles distant from Attleborough. "These men," writes Dr. Heylin, "pretended only against enclosures; and if religion was at all regarded by them, it was rather kept for a reserve, than suffered to appear in the front of the battle. But when their numbers were so vastly multiplied, as to amount to twenty thousand, nothing would serve them but the suppression of the gentry, the placing of new counsellors about the king, and somewhat also to be done in favour of the old religion. Concerning which they thus remonstrate to the king, or the people rather; viz., first, 'That the free-born commonalty was oppressed by a small number of gentry, who glutted themselves with pleasure, whilst the poor commons, wasted with daily labour, did (like pack-horses) live in extreme slavery.' Secondly, 'That holy rites, established by antiquity, were abolished; new ones authorized, and a new form of religion obtruded, to the subjecting of their souls to those horrid pains, which no death could terminate.' And there-

fore, thirdly, 'That it was necessary for them to go in person to the king, to place new counsellors about him during his minority, removing those who (ruling as they list) confounded things sacred and profane, and regarded nothing but the enriching of themselves with the public treasure, that they might riot it amidst these public calamities.'” Such are recorded as the complaints of the malcontents at the origin of the Reformation, as it is called, and if we look at the present situation of the country, we shall see that it is not bettered in its condition. We have Jew loan-jobbers, sine-curists and pensioners, half-pay officers, and married parsons, glutting themselves with luxury, whilst the poorer classes are obliged to contribute more than a third of their labour to support these idlers out of the taxes, and work like pack-horses under the slavery of a criminal code a thousand times more galling than the penances imposed upon them by the Catholic clergy, because these were voluntary, and of course performed with cheerfulness.

To the above demands no satisfactory answer was given, and the insurgents marched off for Norwich, where Kett planted his standard on Moushold hill, which overlooked a great part of the city, and gave him full command of it. Here, seated under a large oak, which he called the *oak of reformation*, Kett kept his courts, and carried terror among the neighbouring gentry and citizens of Norwich. The latter had allowed the marquess of Northampton to enter the city with one thousand English horse, and a body of ITALIANS under the command of Malatesta, out of which the marquess was beaten by Kett, and returned in disgrace to London. The council then sent the earl of Warwick with eight thousand men, two thousand being GERMAN horse, by whom the insurgents were defeated, after a long and desperate struggle. More than two thousand perished by the sword, Kett and nine others were hanged, and the remainder were granted a general pardon. Thus it will be seen that the introduction of the *Reformation*, as it is misnamed, produced in its progress not only a change in religion, but a gross

violation of the principles of the constitution, the most impious sacrileges and spoliations, and a waste of human blood hitherto unparalleled in the annals of the country, arising from the discontents of the people. England had been Catholic nine hundred years, and during that long period but one insurrection occurred on the part of the people, namely, that under Wat Tyler, occasioned in part from the heavy taxation produced by a long war with France, and the seditious doctrines of ignorant preachers, instigated by Wickliffe and his adherents. This rising, however, was put down with a trivial loss of blood, compared with the amount shed in the insurrections of Harry and Edward's reigns, from the innovations then made on religion and the inroads on the constitution. The civil war between the houses of York and Lancaster, and the frequent appeals to arms by the barons, had nothing of the character of religion in them, nor did they spring from gross oppressions of the poor. The people in those times were in the possession of plenty and ease, but the *Reformation* has taken from them those means which secured them against want and contumely, and instead of the profusion which abounded on the tables of the Catholic people of England, and the visible effects of good living displayed in their robust countenances and hardy frames, we now see the hearty meal reduced to the meagre mess of potatoes, and the people exhibiting the care-worn visages of misery and the lank, emaciated forms of want. And this change in the time of Edward VI., when Tom Cranmer was archbishop of Canterbury, was effected by FOREIGN BAYONETS!

Connected with these scenes, we must notice the treatment of bishop Bonner, whose name is so familiar with the readers of the *Book of Martyrs*, where he is delineated a monster delighting in the blood of the innocent. Of this, however, we shall have to speak by and by. Burnet has represented that the people were fond of the *new preachers*; the commotions we have recorded give the lie to this statement, and prove that nine-tenths of the nation were in favour of the creed of their fathers, and opposed to the mongrel doctrines

invented by the reformers. The innovators, however, relied on the support of the crown, and resolved to get rid of some of the most obnoxious of their adversaries in the church who stood up for the old creed. Among these was bishop Bonner. He was summoned before the council, and ordered to perform the new service at St. Paul's; besides which he was commanded to preach at St. Paul's Cross, and the heads of his sermon were selected for him. One of these was to shew that "the rebels in Devonshire, Cornwall, and Norfolk, did not only deserve death as traitors, but accumulated to themselves eternal damnation, even to be in the burning fire of hell, with Lucifer, the father and first author of rebellion." Mark! this was the doctrine of the reformers of the 16th century, who had rebelled against the lawful authority of the church, but would not admit of any resistance to their views under pain of damnation. At the day appointed, crowds of people assembled to hear the prelate, and Latimer and Hooper, the latter being afterwards made a bishop, were appointed to inform against him, if he did not comply with sufficient exactness. He was denounced by these reformers or spies to the council, who appointed a commission, of which Cranmer was at the head, before which Bonner appeared, and by his extensive knowledge in the canon law, and his dignified behaviour before his judges, he maintained his episcopal character, but was deprived of his bishopric, and committed to the Marshalsea prison, where he remained till the king's death. Ridley, one of his judges, was appointed to the see of London, which Bonner filled, but under circumstances the most disgraceful. The bishopric of Westminster was dissolved, and Ridley accepted the lands and revenues, in exchange for the lands and revenues belonging to his own church. These, four days after, were given to three of the principal favourites at court, Rich, lord chancellor; Wentworth, lord chamberlain; and Sir Thomas Darcy, vice chamberlain.

While these disastrous and afflicting matters were going on at home, the affairs of the kingdom were not less disgraceful and unfortunate abroad. Boulogne, as well as Calais,



had been for a long series of years in the hands of the English, and was looked upon as the most honourable appendage of the English crown. The reformers, however, seemed to care as little for the honour of the nation, as for its constitutional rights. The insurrections making so formidable an appearance, induced the king of France to declare war against England, while, we should have observed, this country was hostilely engaged also with Scotland. In this state of things, Somerset, the lord protector, proposed to make peace with Scotland, to surrender Boulogne to Henry II. of France for a *sum of money*, and to enter into a treaty with that monarch *to support the Protestant interest in Germany* against the growing superiority of Charles V. The majority of the council were opposed to this proposition, and pronounced the surrender of Boulogne a measure calculated to bring odium on the king's government. The French, however, were determined to obtain possession of it; they poured troops into the Boulognois, and in less than three weeks they possessed themselves of the fortified outworks of Blackness, Ambleteuse, and Sellacques; the town itself prepared to sustain a regular siege. Equally unfortunate were the English forces in Scotland, for after various disasters, nothing was left them of all their former acquisitions but the fort of Aymouth and the town of Roxburgh. In the meanwhile, the government itself, as well as the country, was torn by factions and divisions, and a party was growing formidable in the ministry against the lord protector. Boulogne had now sustained a twelvemonth's siege, but the internal troubles of the kingdom, occasioned by the rapacious robberies of courtiers and the impious presumption of the reformers of religion, had reduced it to a state of impotency, and it was now determined to crave the assistance of that monarch, who, but a year before, it was proposed to confederate against with the French king. An ambassador was actually sent to the emperor Charles V. to demand succour of him, and request that he would take the town of Boulogne into keeping, till the youthful Edward could settle the differences between his own subjects. Charles would not

listen to the request, unless the king would promise to restore the Catholic religion, which his counsellors not being willing to accede to, Charles would have nothing to do with them. They then entered into a negotiation with France, to bring about which they employed a *foreign* merchant, named Antonio Guidotti, through whose agency ambassadors were named and conferences opened. The French were sensible of their superiority, and accordingly dictated their own terms. The English talked big, but it was mere talk; their actions did not correspond with their words, for every day produced fresh secessions from their terms, and at last they agreed to surrender the town on the terms proposed by the French. "The treaty," writes Dr. Lingard, "was prefaced by a long and fulsome panegyric of the two kings: Henry and Edward were the best of princes, the two great luminaries of the Christian world: personally they had no causes of enmity against each other: and as for the relics of that hostility which had divided their fathers, they were determined to suppress them for ever. With this view they had agreed, first, that there should be between the two crowns a peace, league, and union, which should last not only for their lives, but as long as time should endure: second, that Boulogne should be restored to the king of France, with the ordnance and stores, which were found in it at the time of its capture: that in return for the expense of keeping up the fortifications, Henry should pay to Edward two hundred thousand crowns at the time of its delivery, and two hundred thousand more within five months; on condition that the English should previously surrender Dunglass and Lauder to the queen of Scots, or, if Dunglass and Lauder were not in their possession, should raze to the ground the fortresses of Roxburgh and Aymouth: third, that Scotland should be comprehended in this treaty, if the queen signified her acceptance of it within forty days; and that Edward should not hereafter make war upon her or her subjects, unless some new cause of offence were given: and lastly, that all the rights, claims, and pretensions of England against France and Scotland, or

of France and Scotland against England, should be mutually reserved. Though Warwick had signed the instructions to the ambassadors, he absented himself, under the pretence of sickness, from the council on the day on which the treaty was confirmed. By the public the conditions were considered a national disgrace. The sum of two millions of crowns, which Francis had consented to give for the surrender of Boulogne at the expiration of eight years, had been cut down to one-fifth : the right of enforcing the treaty of marriage between Edward and Mary of Scotland had been abandoned : and the perpetual pension, which Henry VIII. had accepted in lieu of his claim to the crown of France, had been virtually surrendered. In fact the pretensions of the former kings of England were, after this treaty, suffered to sleep in silence by their successors. They contented themselves with the sole title of kings of France, a barren but invidious distinction, which, after two centuries and a half, has been wisely laid aside by the father of his present majesty." Such were the fruits, both foreign and domestic, produced by the departure of the nation from that system of religion which, guiding all its believers in the way of truth, and inculcating principles the most moral and virtuous, filled our Catholic ancestors with the most noble and heroic actions, and rendered England the most happy and powerful kingdom on the earth. Under Henry V. France was subdued, single handed, to the crown of England ; under the Protestant king Edward VI. her arms were sullied by cowardice and treachery, and her honour stained by the bad faith of her rulers. Guidotti was rewarded, according to Dr. Heylin, with knight-hood, a present of one thousand crowns, and an annual pension of as much to maintain his dignity, besides a pension of two hundred and fifty crowns per annum for his son.

#### BURNING OF HERETICS.

Before we commence our remarks on this part of the "PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION," we will give the account of these burnings from the modern *Book of Martyrs*.

We have compared it with Burnet's Abridgement, and we find it is a still further abridgement, the most material points regarding Cranmer being left out. But to the story. The modern editors say : " There were some Anabaptists at this time in England, who came from Germany. Of these there were two sorts ; the first only objected to the baptizing of children, and to the manner of it, by sprinkling instead of dipping. The other held many opinions, anciently condemned as heresies : they had raised *a war* in Germany, and had set up *a new king* at Munster ; but all these were called Anabaptists, from their opposition to infant baptism, though it was one of *the mildest opinions they held*. When they came to England, a commission was granted to some *bishops*, and others, to *search them out, and proceed against them*. Several of these persons, on being *taken up* and brought before them, *abjured their errors*, some of which were, ' That there was not a Trinity of persons ; that Christ was not God, and took not flesh of the Virgin ; and that a regenerate man could not sin.' "

" Joan Bocher, called Joan of Kent, one of their proselytes, persisted in her error, and denied that Christ took flesh of the substance of his mother ; *she was intolerably vain of her notions*, and rejected with scorn all the *instructions* offered her ; she was *therefore* condemned as *an obstinate heretic*, and delivered to the secular power. But it was with the most extreme reluctance that the king signed the warrant for her execution ; he thought it was an instance of the same spirit of cruelty for which the reformers condemned the Papists ; and notwithstanding all the arguments that were used with him, he was rather silenced than satisfied, and signed the warrant with tears in his eyes, saying to Cranmer, that since he resigned up himself to his judgment, if he sinned in it, it should lie at his door. This struck the archbishop ; and both he and Ridley took great pains with her, and tried what reason, joined with gentleness, could do. But she growing still more and more insolent, at last was burnt, and ended her life *very indecently*, breaking out often in *jeers and reproaches*.

“Some time after this, George van Parre, a Dutchman, was also condemned and *burnt*, for *denying the divinity of Christ*, saying that the Father *only* was God. He had led a *very exemplary life*, both for fasting, devotion, and a good conversation, and suffered with extraordinary composure of mind. Against the other sort of Anabaptists no severities were used: but several books were written to *justify infant baptism*; and the practice of *the church*, so *clearly begun*, and so *universally spread*, was thought a *good plea*, especially being grounded on such arguments in scripture as demonstrated at least its lawfulness.”

So, so; the reformers then could burn for *heresy* as well as Catholics; and yet all the clamour, all the invective, all the brutal calumny raised on this mode of punishment for religious error, has been levelled against Catholics only. The king, it seems, judged it an instance of cruelty for which the reformers condemned the Papists, and objected to signing the warrants; well, and how did the reformers reply to this objection? This the modern editors have not told us, though Burnet mentions the arguments used by Cranmer. These men of veracity, who publish this book for the purpose of conveying a knowledge of Christianity to their readers, and exciting a hatred of Popery, *suppressed* the arguments of Cranmer for burning this crazy old woman, considering, we have no doubt, that they would be thought to bear too hard upon the hoary old miscreant, who cared not whom he sent to the stake, so that he escaped with a whole skin. He was always ready to comply with the merciless edicts of a beastly tyrant, and here he was urging a royal youth to an act of cruelty against his inclination. But let us see what he had to urge against the “intolerably vain” heretic. Burnet says, that “Cranmer persuaded him, that he, being GOD’S lieutenant, was *bound* in the first place *to punish* those offences committed against God: he also alleged the law of Moses for punishing blasphemy; and he thought the errors that struck immediately against the apostles’ creed *ought* to be *capitally* punished.” Dr. Heylin tells us, that she was con-



vened before archbishop Cranmer and his assistants, in the church of St. Paul, and that her crime was, "That she denied Christ to have taken flesh from the Virgin Mary, affirming (as the Valentinians did of old) that he only passed through her body, as water through the pipe of a conduit, without participating anything of that body through which he passed;" and that when Cranmer "was upon the point of passing sentence upon her, for persisting obstinate in so gross a heresy, she most maliciously reproached him for passing the like sentence of condemnation on another woman, called Anne Askew, for denying the carnal presence of Christ in the sacrament; telling him, that he condemned the said Anne Askew not long before for a piece of bread, and was then ready to condemn her for a piece of flesh." Dr. Lingard gives her answer to the archbishop in much more pungent terms than Heylin does. This historian tells us she replied to Tom Cranmer in these words:—"It is a goodly matter to consider *your* ignorance. It was not long ago that you burned Anne Askew for a piece of bread; and yet you came yourselves soon after to *believe and profess the same doctrine for which you burned her*; and now, forsooth, you will needs burn me for a piece of flesh, and in the end will come to believe this also, *when you have READ the scriptures and UNDERSTAND THEM.*" We should have liked to have seen the reforming apostles of the church of England, when Joan threw this smart charge of inconsistency in their face. Surely they must have looked very foolish at each other. Burnet says "she was intolerably vain of her notions;" it does not appear that her judges were so vain of *their* notions, when they could condemn a woman for a belief which they afterwards adopted themselves. The fact, however, was, Joan and Anne were both wild enthusiasts, while their judges were cold and calculating reformists, veering with every change of the tide at court; now adopting transubstantiation because Harry willed it so; now rejecting it because it was more fashionable; and had the wind blown the same notion that Joan was sentenced to death for, there is no doubt but

her judges would have fulfilled her predictions. We are not surprised that Burnet should think Mrs. Joan "was intolerably vain of her notions" when she told her judges that they were *ignorant*, not having *read the scriptures*, and therefore *did not understand them*. This is the same with all bible readers, who build upon their own superior knowledge of interpretation; and as the ground work of the Reformation, so miscalled, was the allowing every one, however illiterate, to interpret the mysterious word according to his own fancy, who was to decide between the disputants? What right could Tom Cranmer, and Latimer, and the rest of her judges, have to condemn Joan Bocher, or any other Joan or Judy among the whole tribe of bible readers, for heresy, when they themselves had been guilty of it, and had refused submission to the only unerring tribunal that had legitimate cognizance of erroneous doctrines. Only think, sensible reader, of a man invested with the character of a judge, condemning a poor silly woman under the authority of a tyrant, for having taken a strange notion in her head on religious matters, and then embracing and teaching the self-same doctrine which the unfortunate woman was burned for. Then see this same man urging a youth (whose merciful disposition made him shudder at the idea of sending a woman out of the world while she remained in sin, lest her soul should be consigned to everlasting torments) to sign the death warrant of his victim, and *quoting scripture* to back his cruel request. Yet this unfeeling monster—this hoary villain—this panderer to the vices of the basest men in power—is held up to this day, by bigotted and interested individuals, as a paragon of virtue and a holy martyr to the Protestant religion, and is believed to be so by hundreds of credulous and ignorant people!

We do not attempt to justify, but condemn, the putting heretics to death for mere speculative doctrine; but as Protestants have been guilty of burning for heresy, as well as ripping and hanging for truth, it may not be amiss to point out some shades of difference between them and Catholic states in the exercise of this civil prerogative, for there is no

authority existing in the church to authorize the putting any-one to death for any error of the mind. The Arians were the first to *persecute* for conscience sake, after the establishment of Christianity and the eradication of Paganism; the Inconoclasts the next; and we have it on record that St. Ambrose and St. Martin, two great luminaries of the Catholic church, refused to hold communion with a Spanish bishop, named Ithacius, even against the will of the emperor, because he sought to have certain Priscillian heretics put to death. Heresy, we believe, was not made a capital punishment until those who broached it mingled with it doctrines that were dangerous to the peace and happiness of society, and threatened the subversion of all order. It consequently followed that kings and magistrates found themselves necessitated to adopt some strong measures to secure their own authority, and hence arose the statutes enacted to punish heresy with death. In these cases the offender was taken before his ecclesiastical judges, who examined the doctrines he maintained, pointed out to him the erroneousness of his opinions, and if he continued obstinate, after due time was allowed him for reflection, he was pronounced contumacious and handed over to the secular power.

This was the mode of proceeding with Joan Bocher, but *who* were *her* judges, and *what* authority had *they* to pronounce her a heretic. In those cases where Catholics were concerned, it is to be observed that their decisions were made according to a rule believed to be unerring. They pronounced upon the authority of an undeviating system of faith, brought down from age to age, and followed universally throughout the world. Here then it was antiquity and uniformity against novelty and disunion. Now this was not the case with Cranmer and Joan Bocher. Her judges had departed themselves from the invariable rule; they had set up reason, fallible human reason, as their guide; they allowed private interpretation of the scriptures; and at the same time they passed laws to punish individuals who did not or would not think as they did; they had them arrested; they sat in

judgment upon them; and with the utmost composure sentenced them to death, though it does not appear that the error maintained in the least affected the safety of the state. Here then we have real sheer tyranny; because the judges in this case did not decide by legitimate authority, and were themselves infected with the same crime. They condemned the woman for exercising a right which they said she possessed, and was to use according to her own judgment, and punished her because she could not see as they pretended to see. Thus we have shewn that there is a very great difference between Catholic divines pronouncing upon heresy, and the decisions of Protestants on that offence. The former decide according to an ancient and unerring law; the latter according to their own whim and fancy, which the other culprit under trial, if a Protestant, would probably exercise over his judges were the tables reversed, and the power placed in his hands. This, as we have said before, is pure despotic tyranny; but the other is *law*, though subject to abuse, through human agency, and we have no doubt has been abused.

The saying of the king to Cranmer, "that since he resigned up himself to his judgment, if he sinned in it, it should lie at his door," seems to have struck old Tom a little queerly, and he and Ridley set about making a convert of old Joan. But how could they expect to remove Joan's opinion, when she was sensible that they had themselves shuffled in their own, and that too for their temporal interests. Hence when she was taken to the stake, and Dr. Scory undertook to refute her opinion in a sermon to the people, she told him, "he lied *like a rogue*, and had better go home and *study the scriptures*." Von Parris, or Von Parre, the other victim sent to the stake, was a surgeon in London. He was also arraigned before Cranmer, Ridley, Coverdale and others, after having been excommunicated by his brethren of the Dutch church. This man seems to have been a moralist, nor does there appear to have been the least charge of a seditious nature against him. He was burned purely for his speculative opinions, but Burnet is forced to acknowledge, though

the modern editors have suppressed the admission, that this man's death "cast a great blemish on the reformers."

#### DIVISION AMONG THE REFORMERS.

In taking leave of the foregoing subject for the present, it is necessary that we should observe, that while Cranmer and his associates were thus proscribing with fire and fagot Unitarian sentiments, a convenient latitude was given to other sectarians, and *foreign* religionists, as well as foreign troops, were encouraged to settle in the kingdom. Men of every sect as well as of every nation found an asylum in the palace of Cranmer, and he procured for them livings in the church and protection at court. In return for these favours, some accommodated their consciences to the existing order of things. There was one, however, of the native reformers, whose vagaries and obstinacy led to a train of confusion and disorder, which had nigh proved fatal to the new church, and have left testimony of the fallacy of her foundation, and another instance of the subtlety of Tom Cranmer. This incident we shall give in the words of Dr. Lingard:—"John Hooper, by his activity, his fervid declamation, and his bold though intemperate zeal, had deserved the applause and gratitude of the well-wishers to the new doctrines. Edward named him to the bishopric of Gloucester; when the preacher himself opposed an unexpected obstacle to his own promotion. How could *he* swear obedience to the metropolitan, who was determined to obey no spiritual authority but that of the scriptures? How could he submit to wear the episcopal habits, the livery of that church, which he had so often denominated the harlot of Babylon? Cramner and Ridley attempted to convince him by argument, and to influence him by authority: Bucer reminded him that to the pure all things are pure: and Peter Martyr contended that the wearing of episcopal habits, though meet, in his opinion, to be abolished, was yet an indifferent matter, in which the most timorous might conscientiously acquiesce: on the other hand, the Helvetic divines applauded his consistency: the earl of



Warwick conjured the archbishop to yield in favour of his extraordinary merit: and the king promised to protect that prelate from the penalties, to which he might subject himself by swerving from the ordinal. But Cranmer was unwilling to incur the danger of a *præmunire*: and Hooper not only refused to submit, but published a justification of his conduct, and from the pulpit declaimed against the habits, the ordinal, and the council. The new church was on the point of being torn into fragments by the intemperance of her own children, when the royal authority interposed, and committed the refractory preacher to the Fleet. In the confinement of a prison, the fervour of his imagination gradually cooled; the rigour of his conscience relaxed; he condescended to put on the polluted habit; he took the obnoxious oath; he accepted from the king a patent, empowering him to govern the diocese of Gloucester; and fourteen months later was transferred to the united bishoprics of Gloucester and Worcester. By this union a wider field was opened for the exercise of his zeal; but at the same time an ample source was supplied for the depredations of the courtiers. With a double diocese he retained a less income: the larger portion of the revenues of the two sees was destined to be divided among the men, who at this period were actively employed in carving out of the possessions of the church fortunes for themselves and their posterity."

Dr. Heylin, speaking of this transaction, says: "Thus we have the first beginning of that opposition, *which hath continued ever since*, against the liturgy itself, the cap and surplice, and other rights and usages of the Anglican church." These oppositions were introduced by one John a Lasco, a German, who took sanctuary in England, and was allowed liberty of conscience, in return for which he took great liberty with the discipline of the new church. Peter Martyr, of whom we have before spoken, was another of the dissidents, and objected to the wearing of *square* caps, because he had a *round* head. He was joined by many others, and square caps, gowns and tippets, were cried down as super-

stitious and Popish attire. To shew the state to which religion was reduced at this period, if we may be allowed the term, we will here give the statement of Dr. Heylin, who, being a Protestant divine, must be considered unimpeachable authority in the case. "Such," writes the doctor, "were the effects of Calvin's interposings in behalf of Hooper, and such the effects of his exceptions against some ancient usages in the public liturgy; and such the consequences of the indulgence to John a Lasco, and his church of strangers, opposite both in practice and point of judgment to the established rules and orders of the church of England. For what did follow hereupon, but a continual multiplying of disorders in all parts of this church? What from the sitting at the sacrament, used and maintained by John a Lasco, but first irreverence in receiving, and afterwards a contempt and depraving of it? What from the crying down of the sacred vestments, and the grave habit of the clergy, but first a disesteem of the men themselves, and by degrees a vilifying and contempt of their holy ministry? Nay, such a peccancy of humour began then manifestly to break out, that it was preached at Paul's Cross by one Sir Steven (for so they commonly called such of the clergy as were under the degree of doctor), the curate of St. Katherine Christ church, that it was fit the names of churches should be altered, and the names of the days in the week changed; that fish-days should be kept on any other days than on Fridays and Saturdays, and the Lent at any other time except only between Shrovetide and Easter. We are told also by John Stow, that he had seen the said Sir Steven to leave the pulpit, and preach to the people out of an high elm, which stood in the midst of the churchyard; and that being done, to return into the church again, and leaving the high altar, to sing the communion service upon a tomb of the dead, with his face toward the north. Which is to be observed the rather, because Sir Steven hath found so many followers in these latter times. For as some of the preciser sort have left the church to preach in woods and barns, &c., and instead of the names of

the holiday and months, can find no other title for them than the first, second, or third month of the year, and the first, second, or third day of the week, &c., so was it propounded not long since by some state-reformers, 'that the Lenten fast should be kept no longer between Shrovetide and Easter, but rather (by some act or ordinance to be made for that purpose), betwixt Easter and Whitsuntide.' To such wild fancies do men grow, when once they break those bonds and neglect those rules which wise antiquity ordained for the preservation of peace and order."

Wild as these fancies might be considered by the doctor, they were followed by a general order for the taking down of altars, bearing date the 24th of November, 1550, and subscribed by the duke of Somerset, the archbishop of Canterbury, and others. For the advancement of this work, John Hooper observed, in a sermon before his king: "that it would be very well, that it might please the *magistrate*, to turn the *altars* into *tables*, according to the first institution of Christ; and thereby to take away the false persuasion of the people, which they have of *sacrifices* to be done upon *altars*. Because (said he) as long as altars remain, both the ignorant people and the ignorant and evil persuaded priest will dream always of *sacrifice*." Such was the recommendation of one of the chief and turbulent reformers; but though his advice was followed to the destruction and pillaging of those necessary appendages to the temple of the living God, yet the adorable sacrifice of the mass could not be wholly obliterated from the minds of the people, and it is daily offered at this day in almost every part of England. This change of *altars* into *tables* was the occasion of much derision and satire. The differences of opinion among the reformers might fairly be compared to the confused tongues among the Babel-builders. The ministers who had to officiate were at a loss to know where they were to stand at the table; whether at this end or that end, or in the middle. Bishop Ridley called it an oyster-board, and White, of Lincoln, according to John Fox, in his original work, said, "that when their table was con-

stituted, they could never be content in placing the same ; now east, now north ; now one way, now another ; until it pleased God in his goodness to place it quite out of the church." Dr. Heylin says : " The like did Weston, (the prolocutor of the convocation in the first of queen Mary) in a disputation held with Latimer ; telling him, with reproach and contempt enough, that the Protestants having turned their table, *were like a company of apes, that knew not which way to turn their tails* ; looking one day east, and another day west ; one this way, and another that way, as their fancies led them. Thus, finally, one Miles Hubbard, in a book called 'The Display of Protestants,' printed in 1556, p. 81, doth report the business, 'How long (say they) were they learning to set their tables to minister the communion upon ? First they placed it aloft, where the high altar stood ; then must it be removed from the wall, that one might go between ; the ministers being in contention whether part to turn their faces, either toward the west, the north, or south ; some would stand westward, some northward, some southward.' " To settle these diversities, a rubrick was drawn up, and the north side was pitched upon as the most proper place for the table. We have before noticed the changes made in the liturgy, arising from the factious and capricious whims of the leading reformers, who blasphemously stated that every alteration was made under the influence of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth.

Much has been said of late on the subject of EXCOMMUNICATION, and it has been frequently brought as a heavy charge against the Catholic clergy of Ireland, to justify the exclusion of the Irish people from the exercise of their civil rights. The power of excommunication, or separating the unbeliever from the faithful, is clearly established in the scriptures, and it is exercised by all sects, though we never hear any complaint made against the use of this prerogative except when applied to the Catholic church. We have seen that the Anabaptists excommunicated Von Parris for Unitarianism, and we are now about to shew that one of the greatest

of the sixteenth century reformers thought it necessary to call for this ancient discipline of the church, the new bishops of Edward's making, having somehow or other lost, or were restrained in, the right of exercising it ; but were subsequently empowered by *act of parliament* to assume it. The strifes amongst the reforming divines, and the repeated changes and alterations made in the creed and ceremonies of the new church, all tending to a relaxation of morals and devotion, produced the most dismal consequences in the condition of the people, whose habits were now marked by the grossest vices and the most impure debaucheries. Latimer, who was appointed bishop of Worcester by Harry, but resigned his see rather than sign the six articles, in a sermon before the young head of the church, complained of the luxury and vanity of the age, and of many called gospellers, who were concerned for nothing but abbey and chantry lands, and he thus, according to Dr. Heylin, called for the restitution of the ancient discipline: "Lechery," says he, "is used in England, and such lechery as is used in no other part of the world : and yet it is made a matter of sport, a matter of nothing, a laughing matter, a trifle not to be passed on, nor reformed. Well, I trust it will be amended one day, and I hope to see it mended, as old as I am. And here I will make a suit to your highness, to restore unto the church the discipline of Christ, in excommunicating such as be notable offenders. Nor never devise any other way ; for no man is able to devise any better than that God hath done with excommunication to put them from the congregation, till they be confounded. Therefore restore Christ's discipline for excommunication ; and that shall be a means both to pacify God's wrath and indignation, and also that less abomination shall be used than in times past hath been, or is at this day. I speak this of a conscience, and I mean to move it of a will to your grace and your realm. Bring into the church of England the open discipline of excommunication, that open sinners may be stricken with all." He also complained, Burnet says, that the king's debts were not paid, and yet his officers grew vastly rich.



What the Protestants understood by excommunication, and how the excommunicated are to be avoided, we may gather from the 33rd of the 42 of Edward's articles, and the 39 of Elizabeth's. It says: "That person which, by open denunciation of the church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the church, and excommunicate, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and a publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the church by a judge that hath authority thereunto." And Rogers, in his explanation of it, tells us, "that the most severe and uttermost punishment that the visible church can inflict upon the wicked, is excommunication. Which is to put the wicked doer from the company of the faithful, to deliver him unto Satan, and to denounce him a heathen and a publican. A man so cut off from the congregation, and excommunicated, is not to be eaten withal, nor to be received into a house." Such is the punishment of excommunication by the church of England; let us then not hear it alleged any more against the Catholics.

We have said enough to shew the progress that was made in the Reformation, so called, during the reign of this boy pope. To the nation at large the consequences were of the most afflicting nature. While some of the most unprincipled men were exalted at court, and enriched by the spoils of the church, the people were reduced to the lowest state of beggary and want, and the clergy of the new establishment were the most ignorant and debased of their profession. Dr. Heylin, in summing up the transactions of Edward's reign, says: "that such was the rapacity of the times, and the unfortunateness of his condition, that his minority was abused to many acts of spoil and rapine (even to an high degree of sacrilege), to the raising of some, and the enriching of others, without any manner of improvement to his own estate. For notwithstanding the great and most inestimable treasures, which must needs come by the spoil of so many shrines and images, the sale of all the lands belonging to chantries, colleges, free chapels, &c., and the dilapidating of the patrimony of so many

bishoprics and cathedral churches; he was not only plunged in debt, but the crown lands were much diminished and impaired, since his coming to it. Besides which spoils, there were many other helps, and some great ones too, of keeping him from being both before-hand and full of money, had they been used to his advantage. The lands of divers of the halls and companies in London were charged with annual pensions for the finding of such lights, obits, and chantry priests, as were founded by the donors of them: for the redeeming whereof they were constrained to pay the sum of twenty thousand pounds to the use of the king, by an order from the council table; not long before the payment of the first money for the sale of Boulogne, anno 1550. And somewhat was also paid by the city to the king for the purchase of the borough of Southwark, which they bought of him the next year. But the main glut of treasure was that of the four hundred thousand crowns, amounting in our money to 133,333*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, paid by the French king on the surrendry of the town and territory of Boulogne, before remembered. Of which vast sum (but small in reference to the loss of so great a strength) no less than four-score thousand pounds was laid up in the tower, the rest assigned to public uses for the peace and safety of the kingdom. Not to say anything of that yearly profit which came in from the Mint, after the intercourse settled betwixt him and the king of Sweden, and the decrying so much base money, had begun to set the same on work. Which great advantage notwithstanding, he is now found to be in debt to the bankers of Antwerp, and elsewhere, no less than 251,000*l.* of English money."

Such was the deplorable state of England, brought on by the reformers in religion. By the same authority we learn too, that these state cormorants, when they found the kingdom placed in such difficulties, adopted similar notable means to retrieve it from embarrassment that we have seen put in practice in our time, when the cry of reform became too loud to be passed unheeded. The doctor tells us, "they fell upon a course to lessen the expenses of his court and family, by

suppressing the tables formerly appointed for young lords, the masters of the requests, the serjeants-at-arms, &c., which though it saved some money, yet it brought in none. In the next place, it was resolved to call such officers to a present and public reckoning, who either had embezzled any of the crown lands, or inverted any of the king's money to their private use. On which course they were the more intent, because they did both serve the king and content the people; but might be used by them as a scourge, for the whipping of those against whom they had any cause to quarrel. Amongst which I find the new lord Paget to have been fined six thousand pounds (as before was said) for divers offences of that nature, which were charged upon him. Beaumont, then master of the rolls, had purchased lands with the king's money, made longer leases of some other crown lands than he was authorised to do by his commission, and was otherwise guilty of much corrupt and fraudulent dealings: for expiating of which crimes, he surrendered all his lands and goods to the king, and seems to have been well befriended that he sped no worse. The like offences proved against one Whaley, one of the king's receivers for the county of York; for which he was punished with the loss of his offices, and adjudged to stand to any such fine as by his majesty and the lords of the council should be set upon him. Which manner of proceeding, though it be for the most part pleasing to the common people, and profitable to the commonwealth, yet were it more unto the honour of a prince to make such officers whom he thinks not likely to offend, than to sacrifice them to the people and his own displeasures, having thus offended."

#### FATE OF THE PRINCIPAL ACTORS.

We have given a detail of the evil effects produced by the Reformation on the people; we shall now proceed to shew the fate of some of the leading characters in the unholy transactions of this reign. The king was the child of Jane Seymour, from whose body he was ripped, and was, of course, the death of his mother, under his father's order. This queen

had two brothers, Edward and Thomas, who rose to great favour under Henry, and to higher honours when their nephew came to the throne. Edward was made lord protector, and Thomas had the post of lord high admiral. The latter besides married Catherine Parr, the queen dowager, and the former took for his wife one Ann Stanhope, who is represented as a woman of an ambitious temper, and envious that her husband's brother's wife should have been a queen. She knew no will but her own, and she could not brook that she, being the wife of the lord protector, should give way to his younger brother, who claimed precedency of her as queen dowager. Dr. Heylin tells us she thus said within herself: "Am I not wife to the *protector*, who is king in *power* though not in *title*, a *duke* in order and degree, *lord treasurer*, and *earl marshal*, and what else he pleased; and one who hath ennobled his highest honours by his late victory? And did not Henry marry Catherine Parr in his doting days, when he had brought himself to such a condition by his lusts and cruelty, that no lady who stood upon her honour would adventure on him? Do not all knees bow before me, and all tongues celebrate my praises, and all hands pay the tribute of obedience to me, and all eyes look upon me, as the first in state; through whose hands the principal officers in the court, and chief preferments in the church, are observed to pass? Have I so long commanded him who commands two kingdoms, and shall I now give place to her, who in her former best estate was but Latimer's widow, and is now fain to cast herself for support and countenance into the despised bed of a younger brother? If Mr. Admiral teach his wife no better manners, I am she that will; and will choose rather to remove them both (whether out of the court, or out of the world, shall be no great matter), than be outshined in my own sphere, and trampled on within the verge of my jurisdiction."

With this disposition she went to work with her husband, and it was not long before she contrived to fill his head with an implacable jealousy against his brother. The lord admiral was equally as ambitious as the lord protector, and superior

in abilities : he not only married a queen, but he aspired to the hand of the king's sister Elizabeth, while his dowager queen was alive. Dr. Lingard says: " His attentions to the princess were remarked ; and their familiarity was so undisguised, that it afforded employment to the propagators of scandal, and awakened the jealousy of his wife, by whom he was one day surprized with Elizabeth in his arms. But the queen in a short time died in child-birth ; and her death happened so opportunely for his project, that by the malice of his enemies it was attributed to poison." He now redoubled his suit to the princess Elizabeth, began to intrigue with some of the discontented courtiers, and thus raised an excuse for his brother to have him arrested. This was accordingly done, he was committed to the Tower, charges of high treason were preferred against him, a bill of attainder was brought into the House of Lords, where his brother attended every stage of the bill, the third reading of which was agreed to without a division. In the Commons it met with some opposition, but was eventually passed, and received the royal assent at the end of the session. Three days after, the warrant for his execution was signed by the council, and, among other names, appeared those of SEYMOUR and CRANMER, " both of whom," Dr. Lingard justly observes, " might, it was thought, have abstained from the ungracious office, the one on account of his relationship to the prisoner, the other because the canons prohibited to clergymen all participation in judgments of blood." Thus fell one of the uncles of the youthful pope and king. He was a partaker in the spoils of the church and the poor, and he now received his reward for conniving at such unhallowed sacrileges. Dr. Heylin tells us, he had a grant of 100 marks annually, and a convenient house out of the property of the dissolved order of St. John of Jerusalem. He was afterwards created Lord Seymour of Sudley, having obtained possession of the manor and castle of Sudley by the attainder of the rightful owner, Lord Botteler, whose greatest crime, Heylin says, was the being owner of so goodly a manor, which the greedy courtiers had cast their eyes upon. The



lord high admiral obtained it, along with the title, but had scarcely come into possession of it, when he lost both, together with his head, and it fell once more into the hands of the crown, where it remained till queen Mary conferred it upon Sir John Bruges, who derived his pedigree from the ancient inheritors of the estate.

The lord protector having removed his brother, the object of his jealousy, but the prop of his house, now thought himself omnipotent, and projected the erection of a magnificent palace, which should exalt him in the eyes of the nation. To give the reader an idea of the veneration in which the reformers of religion held the temples of the living God in those days, we will here give the account of the erection of this structure, as told by Dr. Heylin. "He had," writes the doctor, "been brought out of his purpose for building on the deanery and close of Westminster, and casts his eye upon a piece of ground in the Strand, on which stood three episcopal houses and one parish church; the parish church dedicated to the Virgin Mary, the houses belonging to the bishops of Worcester, Lichfield, and Landaff. All these he takes into his hands, the owners not daring to oppose, and therefore willingly consenting to it. Having cleared the place, and projected the intended fabric, the workmen found that more materials would be wanting to go through with it than the demolished church and houses could afford unto them. He thereupon resolves for taking down the parish church of St. Margaret's, in Westminster, and turning the parishioners for the celebrating of all divine offices into some part of the nave or main body of the abbey church, which should be marked out for that purpose. But the workmen had no sooner advanced their scaffolds, when the parishioners gathered together in great multitudes, with bows and arrows, staves and clubs, and other such offensive weapons; which so terrified the workmen, that they ran away in great amazement, and never could be brought again upon that employment. In the next place he is informed of some superfluous, or rather superstitious, buildings on the north side of St. Paul's; that is to

say, a goodly cloister, environing a goodly piece of ground, called Pardon-church-yard, with a chapel in the midst thereof, and beautified with a piece of most curious workmanship, called the dance of death, together with a fair charnel house, on the south side of the church, and a chapel thereunto belonging. This was conceived to be the safer undertaking, the bishop then standing on his good behaviour, and the dean and chapter of that church (as of all the rest) being no better in a manner (by reason of the late act of parliament) than tenants at will of their great landlords. And upon this he sets his workmen on the 10th of April, takes it all down, converts the stone, timber, lead and iron, to the use of his intended palace, and leaves the bones of the dead bodies to be buried in the fields in unhallowed ground. But all this not sufficing to complete the work, the steeple and most parts of St. John of Jerusalem, not far from Smithfield, most beautifully built not long before by Dockwray, a late prior thereof, was blown up with gunpowder, and all the stone thereof employed to that purpose also. Such was the ground, and such were the materials of the duke's new palace, called Somerset-house; which either he lived not to finish, or else it must be very strange, that after having pulled down two churches, two chapels, and three episcopal houses (each of which may be probably supposed to have had their oratories), to find materials for this fabric, there should be no room purposely erected for religious offices."

This sacrilegious destruction of so many sacred edifices was the prelude to the protector's fall. From this time he met with nothing but disasters and disquietude. The death of his brother was looked upon as a great blot on his character. While he was building his costly palace the exchequer was empty, and the people rose in rebellion. Next followed the misfortunes in Scotland and the loss of Boulogne, which fell into the hands of the French; all which circumstances conjoined raised up a strong party against him in the cabinet, headed by Dudley, earl of Warwick, afterwards made duke of Northumberland, and the lord protector found himself a

prisoner in the Tower, under the accusation of high crimes and misdemeanors.

We must here notice some proceedings in the parliament which met after the arrest of Somerset. An act was passed, the purport of which was to make it felony for any persons to assemble to the number of twelve or more, for the purpose of abating the rents of farms or the price of provisions, or of destroying houses or parks, or of asserting a right to ways or commons, if they continued together one hour after they had been warned to disperse by proclamation from a magistrate, sheriff, or bailiff; and *raising* the offence to *high treason* when the object of the meeting should be to alter the laws, or to kill or imprison any member of the king's council. Another act was passed, subjecting every individual, either clerk or layman, who should keep in his possession any book containing any portion of the ancient service of the church, to a fine for the first and second offence, and to imprisonment during the king's pleasure for the third. A proclamation had been issued previous to the passing of this act, ordering all such books to be delivered up, that they might be burned or destroyed. Thus it will be seen that the era which is called the dawn of liberty was in fact the birth of slavery in this formerly free and happy country; and that the rejection of the pope's spiritual authority led to the tyranny of an oligarchical faction far more oppressive than what had ever been felt even under the most odious of the former sovereigns of the country. From this period to the present day, laws have been passed, infringing on the rights of the people, and the six acts which were passed in 1819, to counteract the proceedings of the reformers of that day, remind us strongly of the laws passed in Edward's parliament. It was never dreamed of by our Catholic legislators to make it high treason to kill or *imprison* a *member* of the king's council; and it was reserved for our own days to pass a law to banish a man for using words that may be *construed* into a *tendency* to bring the members of the king's council into contempt.

But we must leave this digression and return to Somerset.

Though his behaviour was of the most haughty nature when in the plenitude of his power, in his fall he was as abject and crawling. He was told, if he hoped for pardon he must acknowledge his guilt. This condition, which a noble mind would have spurned, was accepted with gratitude. He confessed his presumption *on his knees*, subscribed to the charges produced against him, and implored mercy. Life was promised him on condition that he should forfeit all his offices, his goods and chattels. A bill of pains and penalties was introduced, and, after some opposition, was passed and received the royal assent. In the mean time Somerset plucked up a little courage, and remonstrated against the severity of his punishment; the council reprimanded him, and drew from him another and still more degrading submission. He was then pardoned and set at liberty, and his goods and lands were restored to him by the king's favour.

The downfall of Somerset was the prelude to the advancement and aggrandizement of his enemies. The earl of Warwick was now the greatest man at court, and highest in honours. He was preferred to the office of *lord great master*, and lord high admiral; a sycophant of his, William Lord St. John, was made earl of Wiltshire, and others of his creatures were placed in office or raised in title. But titles without estates were considered in those days, as in these, but empty honours. Now, when a poor peer is made, he is furnished with a pension out of the taxes of the labouring people; then, they cast their eyes on the property of the church, out of which the poor, the sick, and the lame were supported. To shew how the poor were robbed in those days, and how some of the present noble families obtained their riches, we will give the following extract from Dr. Heylin's *History of the Reformation*. "Furnished with offices and honours," says the doctor, "it is to be presumed, that they would find some way to provide themselves of sufficient means to maintain their dignities. The lord Wentworth, being a younger branch of the Wentworths of Yorkshire, had brought some estate with him to the court; though not enough to

keep him up in equipage, with so great a title. The want whereof was supplied in part, by the office of lord-chamberlain, now conferred upon him; but more by the goodly manors of Stebuneth (commonly called Stepney) and Hackney, bestowed upon him by the king, in consideration of the good and faithful services before performed. For so it happened, that the dean and chapter of St. Paul's, laying at the mercy of the times, as before was said, conveyed over to the king the said two manors, on the twelfth day after Christmas now last past, with all the members and appurtenances thereunto belonging. Of which, the last named was valued at the yearly rent of £41 9s. 4d. The other at £140 8s. 11d. *ob.* And, being thus vested in the king, they were by letters patents, being dated the sixteenth of April then next following (1550), transferred upon the said lord Wentworth. By means whereof he was possessed of a goodly territory, extending on the Thames from St. Katharine's, near the Tower of London, to the borders of Essex, near Blackwall: from thence along the river Lea, to Stratford-le-Bow: and fetching a great compass on that side of the city, contains in all no fewer than six and twenty townships, streets, and hamlets; besides such rows of building as have since been added in these latter times. The like provision was made by the new lord Paget, a Londoner by birth, but by good fortune mixed with merit, preferred by degrees, to one of the principal secretaries to the late king Henry; by whom he was employed in many embassies and negotiations. Being thus raised, and able to set up for himself, he had his share in the division of the lands of chantry, free chapels, &c., and got into his hands the episcopal house belonging to the bishop of Exeter, by him enlarged and beautified, and called Paget's house; sold afterwards to Robert, earl of Leicester: from whom it came to the late earls of Essex, and from them took the name of Essex-house, by which it is now best known. But being a great house, is not able to keep itself; he played his game so well, that he got into his possession the manor of Beaudesart (of which he was created baron), and many other fair



estates in the county of Stafford, belonging partly to the dean and chapter of Lichfield: neither of which was able to contend with so great a courtier, who held the see, and had the ear of the protector, and the king's to boot. What other course he took to improve his fortunes, we shall see hereafter, when we come to the last part of the tragedy of the duke of Somerset."

We will here remind the reader that the modern editors, on concluding the first book of Fox's work, make some "remarks on the vengeance of God towards the persecutors of the Christians," in which they shew that most of the persecuting Roman emperors met with an untimely end, as a punishment for their cruelty; and that the Jews, for their obstinacy and wickedness, were annihilated as a nation, and became the scorn and reproach of every people on the earth. (See our first volume of this work.) With equal force do these observations apply to the principal actors in the dismal and destructive tragedy of *England's Reformation*. Of the first promoter of the sacrilegious drama, Henry VIII., we have before spoken. From the time he rejected the spiritual authority of the pope, under which England was free in her domestic affairs, and renowned among the nations abroad, the kingdom became a prey to faction and misery, and the life of Harry was one continued scene of suspicion, caprice, cruelty, and injustice. He spared neither woman in his lust, nor man in his anger; his wives were sent to the block with as little ceremony as cattle are sent to the slaughter-house; his chief motive for seeking a divorce from his virtuous queen Catharine, was that he might have a male heir to succeed him, and secure the crown of England to his family; but in this he was doomed to disappointment. He had a son, it is true, but that son succeeded him when he was incapable of ruling himself, and was, therefore, a tool in the hands of the most impious and unprincipled men that ever cursed an unfortunate country. We have seen that this unhappy youth was constrained to sign the death warrant of a fanatical old woman for *heresy*, at the instigation of Tom Craumer, who

afterwards met the same fate himself ; we have seen the same Cranmer signing, in conjunction with the brother of the culprit, the sentence of death against an uncle of the king, who had to sign the death warrant himself, and we have now to shew the untimely fate of this unnatural brother himself, after having escaped for a short period, through the basest and most servile submission to the dictation of his enemies. Before, however, this act of the tragedy was performed, Dr. Heylin says that several presages occurred in the year 1551, which were looked upon as prognosticating the concussions which afterwards happened in the court, which led to the fall of Somerset and several other noted Reformers, and ended in the death of the king. The first of these prognostics was a terrible earthquake which happened on the 25th of May, at Croydon, and some villages adjoining in Surrey ; another was the appearance of six dolphins in the Thames, three of which were taken at Queenborough, and three near Greenwich ; but the most extraordinary and calamitous scourge was the breaking out of a disease called the *sweating sickness* : “ appearing first,” writes Dr. Heylin, “ at Shrewsbury, on the 15th of April, and after spreading by degrees over all the kingdom, ending its progress in the north, about the beginning of October. Described by a very learned man to be a new, strange, and violent disease ; wherewith if any man were attacked, he died or escaped within nine hours, or ten at most ; if he slept (as most men desired to do), he died within six hours ; if he took cold, he died in three. It was observed to rage chiefly amongst men of strongest constitution and years ; few aged men or women, or young children, being either subject to it, or dying of it. Of which last sort, those of most eminent rank were two of the sons of Charles Brandon ; both dying at Cambridge, both Dukes of Suffolk (as their father had been before), but the youngest following his dead brother so close at the heels, that he only out-lived him long enough to enjoy that title. And that which was yet most strange of all, no foreigner which was then in England (four hundred French attending

here, in the hottest of it, on that king's ambassadors), did perish by it. The English being singled out, tainted, and dying of it in all other countries, without any danger to the natives; called, therefore, in most Latin writers, by the name of *Sudor Anglicus*, or *The English Sweat*. First known amongst us in the beginning of the reign of king Henry VII.; and then beheld as a presage of that troublesome and laborious reign which after followed; the king being for the most part in continual action; and the subjects either sweating out their blood or treasure. Not then so violent and extreme, as it was at the present; such infinite multitudes being at this day swept away by it, that there died eight hundred in one week in London only." The singularity of this disease being confined exclusively to Englishmen, must carry conviction to the mind of every sensible reader, that it was a mark of God's judgment on the nation, for the many impieties and abominable outrages which had been committed by the pretended reformers against his justice and religion.

While the nation was thus suffering by religious quarrels, fomented by imperious demagogues, and the awful visitations of God's anger, the court was thrown into confusion by a new quarrel between Somerset and Warwick. The former had recovered somewhat of his influence over the king, and aspired again to the office of protector, which it was, of course, the interest of the latter to prevent. Accordingly, a renewal of the previous jealousies and dissensions between these two ambitious men and their partisans took place, and conspiracies and cabals became the order of the day. Each party beset the other with spies and informers, and both were deceived and inflamed by false friends and interested advisers. Warwick, however, possessed the advantage over his adversary in the council, and, to strengthen his interest, a new promotion of titles and places was made in favour of his friends. He was himself created duke of Northumberland; the marquis of Dorset was made duke of Suffolk; the earl of Wiltshire, marquis of Winchester; Sir William Herbert,

baron of Cardiff and earl of Pembroke; and others had the honour of knighthood conferred upon them. These proceedings alarmed Somerset, and he began to suspect that some designs were in agitation against his person. These suspicions he soon found confirmed, for on the 16th of October, as he was going to court at Westminster, he was arrested, with Lord Gray, and sent to the Tower. The day following, his duchess and her favourites, Mr. and Mrs. Crane, Sir Thomas Holcroft, Sir Michael Stanhope, Sir Thomas Arundel, Sir Miles Partridge, with two others of the Seymours, and Hammond, and Newdigate, were committed to the same prison. Soon after, they were followed by the Lord Paget, the earl of Arundel, and Lord Dacres of the north. Preparations were soon made for the trial of the prisoners; and we must not here forget the inscrutable designs of Divine Providence. The late lord protector, with unnatural cruelty, refused his unfortunate brother a trial by his peers, was present in the House of Lords when the bill of attainder was in progress against him, and signed the order of council for his death. Now, when arraigned himself, among other charges, for attempting the life of Northumberland, under the act just passed, he found Northumberland, Northampton, and Pembroke, his known enemies, among his judges. Dr. Heylin observes, that these, "being parties to the charge, ought, in all honesty and honour, to have excused themselves from sitting in judgment on him at the time of his trial" This is very true, but the same remark will apply to Somerset himself in his conduct towards his brother, and clearly shews that there was neither honesty nor honour in the transactions of those days. Another proof of this may be found in the mode of Seymour's trial. Although he was brought before his judges (twenty-seven peers, with the new marquis of Wiltshire as lord-steward), yet he was not confronted with the witnesses; only their depositions were produced against him, which had been taken the day preceding the trial. His judges deliberated some time on their verdict, and at length pronounced him guilty of felony, for which he was sentenced

to be hanged, but in consideration of his rank, the sentence was changed to that of beheading. As soon as the sentence was pronounced, this once proud and haughty courtier again fell on his knees, thanked the lords for their impartial conduct during the trial, though he had requested to have the witnesses confronted with him and was denied, asked pardon of Northumberland, Northampton, and Pembroke, whose lives he acknowledged he had sought to take, begged them to solicit the king for mercy in his behalf, and recommended his duchess and children to the pity of the young monarch, his nephew.

Six weeks after his condemnation, Somerset was led out to the scaffold on Tower-hill, on which his brother had suffered through his machinations, but three years before. The modern editors of the *Book of Martyrs* tell us, that "Mr. Fox, the author of this work, was present at the execution," and they favour their readers with his account of the execution. It is too long and tedious for us to give in full, but the following extract will give our readers some idea of Fox's love of truth and his proneness to romancing. In detailing the duke's speech, which he commences by avowing his innocence, Fox makes him say: "Moreover, dearly-beloved friends, there is yet somewhat that I must put you in mind of, as touching Christian religion; which so long as I was in authority, I always diligently set forth and furthered to my power. Neither do I repent me of my doings, but rejoice therein, sith that now the state of Christian religion cometh most near unto the form and order of the primitive church. Which thing I esteem as a great benefit given of God both unto you and me; most heartily exhorting you all, that this, which is most purely set forth unto you, you will with like thankfulness accept and embrace, and set out the same in your living. Which thing if you do not, without doubt greater mischief and calamity will follow.' When he had spoken these words, there was suddenly a terrible noise heard; whereupon there came a great fear upon all men. This noise was as it had been the noise of some great storm



or tempest, which to some seemed to be from above ; as if a great deal of gunpower being inclosed in an armoury, and having caught fire, had violently broken out. But unto some it seemed as though it had been a great multitude of horsemen running together or coming upon them. Such a noise then was in the ears of all, although they saw nothing. Whereby it happened that all the people being amazed without any evident cause, they ran away, some into the ditches and puddles, and some into the houses thereabouts ; others fell down grovelling unto the ground, with their pollaxes and halberds ; and most of them cried out, ' Jesus save us ! Jesus save us ! ' Those who remained in their places, for fear knew not where they were ; and I myself, who was there among the rest, being also afraid in this hurly-burly, stood still amazed. It happened here, *as the evangelist wrote of Christ*, when as the officers of the high priests and pharisees, coming with weapons to take him, being astonished, ran backwards and fell to the ground."

Fox then goes on to relate the remainder of the " meek and gentle " duke's speech, as he calls him, and would make it appear, if he could, that this destroyer of churches, this invader of the property of the poor, this despoiler of the livelihoods of learned men, this murderer of his own brother in cold blood, was an innocent sufferer for the cause of religion, and as pure and pious a martyr as those who suffered under the heathen persecutors. His regard for religion must have been truly great, when it was modelled and remodelled according to the interest and caprice of himself and those who acted under him. But what shall we say to the blasphemy and impiety of this eulogist of the Reformation, and recorder of lies, in comparing the accident which occurred at the death of this offender against God's laws, to the supernatural fear which struck the guards who were sent to apprehend the Saviour of mankind ! Was ever anything so outrageously impious ! so shockingly disgusting ! He represents the noise as terrible and somewhat miraculous upon his own view ; let us now hear what another eye-witness, whose testimony is less tainted, says of this occurrence.

Stowe, in his *Chronicles*, thus relates the matter:—  
“Before eight of the clock the duke was brought to the scaffold inclosed with the king’s guard, the sheriffs’ officers, the warders of the Tower, and others with halberds, the duke being ready to have been executed; suddenly the people were driven into a great fear, few or none knowing the cause; whereof I think it good to write what I saw concerning that matter. The people of a certain hamlet, which were warned to be there by seven of the clock, to give their attendance on the lieutenant, now came through the postern, and perceiving the duke to be already on the scaffold, the foremost began to run, crying to their fellows to follow fast after, which suddenness of these men, being weaponed with bills and halberds, thus running, caused the people which first saw them to think some power had come to have rescued the duke from execution, and therefore to cry ‘away, away;’ whereupon the people ran some one way, some another, many fell into the Tower ditch, and they which tarried thought some pardon had been brought, some said it thundered, some that a great rumbling was in the earth under them, some that the ground moved; but there was no such matter, more than the trampling of their feet, which made some noise.” Compare this plain statement, reader, with the fanatical blasphemy of Fox, and the true merits of the author of the *Book of Martyrs* will soon become manifest.

The confusion occasioned by this sudden movement had scarcely been allayed, when the duke was again interrupted in his speech by the appearance of Sir Anthony Brown on horseback, which caused some of the populace to shout “A pardon, a pardon.” The shout reached the scaffold, but the duke soon learned its inaccuracy, and the disappointment called a hectic colour up to his cheeks; he however resumed his address, which having concluded, he laid his head on the block, and at one stroke it was severed from his body. Thus fell the second uncle of the young king Edward, and a great promoter of the deformation of religion and destroyer of the nation’s happiness and riches, under the sign manual of his

own nephew. Nor did the vengeance of his enemies forsake him here, but extended to his friends and children after his death. This Seymour had two wives, and a son by each. Through the instigation of the second wife, she who plotted the death of his brother the lord admiral, he had procured an act of parliament to be passed in the 32nd year of Henry. for entailing on the son by his second wife all his honours and estates. This act was now repealed, and the duchess and her son were divested of their property and he of his titles, so truly did the hand of God fall upon the guilty in these atrocious deeds.

There was another brother of these Seymours, named *Henry*, who, though he has not made a conspicuous figure in history, and was only a knight, yet being a partaker in the spoils of the church, the fatality of his family was such, that we should not do justice to the public were we to omit the account as we find it related in Heylin's History. Having given the pedigree of Edward the eldest, and Thomas the youngest, whose fate we have just recorded, the doctor writes : " As for Sir Henry Seymour, the second son of Sir John Seymour, he was not found to be of so fine a metal as to make a courtier, and was therefore left unto the life of a country gentleman ; advanced by the power and favour of his elder brother to the order of knighthood ; and afterwards estated in the manors of Marvell and Twyford, in the county of Southampton, dismembered in those broken times from the sec of Winchester. To each of these belonged a park, that of the first containing no less than four miles ; that of the last, but two in compass ; the first being also honoured with a goodly mansion-house, belonging anciently to those bishops, and little inferior to the best of the wealthy bishoprics. There goes a story, that the priest officiating at the altar in the church of Ouslebury (of which parish Marvell was a part), after the mass had been abolished by the king's authority, was violently dragged thence by this Sir Henry, beaten, and most reproachfully handled by him, his servants universally refusing to serve him, as the instruments of his rage and

fury ; and that the poor priest having after an opportunity to get into the church, did openly curse the said Sir Henry, and his posterity, with bell, book, and candle, according to the use observed in the church of Rome ; which, whether it were so or not, or that the main foundation of this estate being laid on sacrilege, could promise no long blessing to it ; certain it is, that his posterity are brought beneath the degree of poverty. For, having three nephews by Sir John Seymour, his only son ; that is to say, Edward, the eldest, Henry and Thomas, younger sons, besides several daughters, there remains not to any of them one foot of land, or so much as a penny of money to supply their necessities, but what they have from the munificence of the marquis of Hertford, or the charity of other well disposed people, which have affection or relation to them."

It is now time to notice the fate of the other individuals accused as the accomplices of the late protector Somerset. Four only were selected for capital punishment, namely, Partridge, Vane, Stanhope, and Arundel. The two first died under the gallows, the last on the scaffold. Of these, Partridge was the most despised, as he was the individual who won the beautiful ring of bells called Jesus' bells, at a cast of dice with king Harry, and caused them to be taken down and melted for his own advantage. Paget was never brought to trial, but made his submission, was degraded from the order of the garter, and paid a considerable fine. The earl of Arundel gained his liberty after an imprisonment of twelve months, but not till he had bound himself to pay annually to the king, for six years, the sum of one thousand pounds.

We shall now close our account of the punishments which fell on the guilty actors in this scene of devastation in Edward's reign, for some were allowed to fall in Mary's time, with the premature end of the young king himself. Warwick having dispatched his rival, Seymour, now meditated the securing of the crown of England to his own family ; and having procured a marriage between his fourth son, Lord

Dudley, and Lady Jane Grey, the daughter of the duke of Suffolk, he persuaded the young king to make a will, setting aside the right of his sisters, Mary and Elizabeth, and conferring the sceptre on the said Lady Jane, and the heirs male of her body. This end was no sooner accomplished than the king began to increase in weakness, and his disease soon baffled the skill of his physicians. During his illness, Dr. Heylin says, he prepared himself for his end with the prayer subjoined, and other meditations. We give it as a curious specimen of the plans devised by the reformers, as they called themselves, to instil prejudice into the youthful mind of the monarch, and to remind the reader how much the nation has gained by its being defended from *Papistry*, if we compare the present misery of the labouring classes, and the happy state of plenty they enjoyed before the thing called the Reformation was known. Here, then, is the prayer, taken, as Dr. Heylin says, from his dying mouth.

“Lord God deliver me out of this miserable and wretched life, and take me among the chosen. Howbeit, not my will, but thine be done. Lord, I commit my spirit to thee. O Lord, thou knowest, how happy it were for me to be with thee: yet for thy Chosen’s sake, send me life and health, that I may truly serve thee. Oh, my Lord God! bless my people and save thine inheritance. O Lord God! save thy chosen people of England. O Lord God! defend this realm from *Papistry*, and maintain thy true religion, that I and my people may praise thy holy name, for Jesus Christ his sake.”

We must admire the devotion and ardour of the young pope in favour of “true religion,” which, by the by, it was impossible for any one to discover amongst the reformers, as it was changed with the same facility as the chameleon does the colour of his skin. The realm has been defended from *Papistry*, with as much zeal and vigour as penal laws and proscription were capable of, and yet it is now gaining ground, to the dismay of the intolerants, while the system of



Protestantism, if such it can be called, is in a rapid state of decay. The immense load of debt and its necessary attendant, taxation, supported by a base paper currency, have reduced the working classes to a state of pauperism, and the nation itself is on the verge of bankruptcy. The religion established by law in Edward's reign, and afterwards by his sister Elizabeth, has but few professors, many of its ministers being latitudinarians and freethinkers. It is only supported by test oaths and proscriptive laws, and should any sudden convulsion take place in the state, its dissolution will follow. But let us return to the young king. Northumberland having obtained his consent to DEPOSE his two sisters, the boy-pope did not survive the deed many days, as death overtook him, after suffering much pain and torture; not without strong suspicions of his having been poisoned by Northumberland. Thus fell the son of the first pope of the church of England, who was the victim of the most unprincipled men; of whom it may be said, he caused the death of his own mother on coming into the world, she being ripped open to give him birth; that he sent his two uncles to the scaffold under the royal warrant; and was himself snatched away by a violent death in the sixteenth year of his age. O God, how inscrutable are thy judgments! how unsearchable thy ways!

Here, then, we close our view of the fate of the principal characters in the dismal scenes of spoliation and sacrilege which accompanied the introduction of that change in the religion of the country, which brought so many evils in its train. If the miserable and untimely death of the Roman persecutors of the primitive Christians were "manifestations of the great displeasure of the Almighty against the persecutors," the same observation must be equally applicable to the violent ends which swept from this world the great destroyers of everything truly religious, and the persecutors of those who stood steadfastly to the faith planted by the apostles, and for which, like the primitive Christians, they suffered martyrdom with the most heroic fortitude. We have shewn in the preceding pages, how the Protestant, or reformed, re-

ligion was first broached in England under Henry, and propagated by the evil counsellors of his son Edward. We have also shewn, at the commencement of this volume, how the Catholic religion was planted by the holy monk Augustin and his pious associates, and the blessings which attended the people on submitting to this divine system of faith and morals. The reader can now see the vast difference between the introduction of the Catholic religion and the destruction of it, with all its beneficent and useful institutions, by Cranmer, Cromwell, Seymour, and others. We have laid bare who and what the men were who preached the pretended doctrines of reform; the means prescribed, and the effects produced; we will here add, in corroboration, the words of father Parsons, taken from the second part of his *Three Conversions*. He writes: "As for the men that first and principally broached these doctrines, they were, for the most part, married friars and apostate priests, that, living in concupiscence of women, and other sensuality, desired to maintain and continue the same by the liberty of this new gospel. The promoters and favourers of these men were such especially of the laity and clergy as had more interest, by the change, for their own promotion and advancement, than conscience, or persuasion of judgment, for the truth of their religion; as would appear, if we should name them one by one that then were of the council and chief authority. The effects and spiritual fruits of this first change were (as you have seen and heard) the most notorious vices of ambition, dissimulation, hatred, deceit, tyranny, and subversion one of another; together with division, dissension, garboils, and desolation of the realm; yea, plain atheism, irreligion, and contempt of all religion that ever was known to have risen up in any kingdom of the world, within the compass of so few years; and (that which is most remarkable) there followed presently the overthrow of all the principal actors and authors of these innovations, by God's own wonderful hand; and this more in these six years, than in sixty, or six score, or perhaps six hundred, hath been seen to have fallen out in

England in other times. And no doubt but it is of singular consideration, that whereas true Christian religion (but especially any change or reformation to the better part) is admitted, there presently do ensue, by usual consequence, great effects of piety, devotion, charity, and virtuous life, if the reformation be sincere, and come from God indeed ; here, on the contrary side, the providence of God did shew a notorious document to the whole world, of the falsehood and wickedness of this new gospel, in that the first professors and promoters thereof in our land fell to more open wickedness in these five years, than in so many fifties before, as hath been said."

## REFORMATION IN IRELAND.

We are told by the modern editors, that "*this year*," but no year is specified, "the Reformation had gained more ground in Ireland than formerly. Henry VIII. had assumed to himself, by consent of the parliament of that kingdom, the title of king of it; the former kings of England having only been called lords of Ireland; and though they were obeyed within the English pale, yet the native Irish continued barbarous and uncivilized, were governed entirely by the heads of their names or tribes, and were obedient or rebellious, as they directed them, The Reformation was set on foot in the English pale, but made small progress among the Irish. At length Bale was sent over to labour among them. He was an eager writer, and a learned, zealous man. Goodacre was made primate of Armagh, and Bale was to be bishop of Ossory. Two Irishmen were also promoted with them; who undertook to advance the Reformation there. The archbishop of Dublin intended to have ordained them by the old pontifical, and all, except Bale, were willing it should be so, but he prevailed that it should be done according to the new book of ordinations; he then went into his diocese, but found all there in dark Popery, and before he could make any progress, the king's death put an end to his designs."

Such is the account given by the modern editors; and we must here observe, that it is somewhat contradictory, inasmuch as it says that the Reformation "had gained more ground," and a few sentences after, that it "made small progress," in Ireland. How these contradictions are to be reconciled, we must leave to the advocates of Burnet and Fox. The duke of Wellington, who is an opposer of the rights of his Catholic countrymen, though his honours were

won by their courage and fidelity, asserted in the House of Lords that the Reformation was introduced into Ireland by the mouth of the cannon and the point of the bayonet; but this new mode of propagating the gospel our modern editors have suppressed. They tell us that Bale was sent over to labour among the Irish, who are described as being “barbarous and uncivilized;” but they should also have stated that the lord protector, Somerset, sent over 600 horse, and 4,000 foot, to civilize this unfortunate people. And how did they proceed to enlighten the darkness of Popery? Historians inform us, by those disgraceful practices which marked the “progress of the Reformation,”—fraud and violence. Having succeeded in lulling the suspicions of the two most eminent chieftains, O’Moore and O’Connor, who surrendered on the pledged faith of the English commander; they had no sooner arrived in England than they were cast into prison, their lands declared forfeited, and bestowed on the very men who had thus villanously violated their plighted troth. Churches were despoiled of their sacred ornaments, which were exposed for sale, and the most fertile districts were laid waste by the ruthless hands of men who pretended to be the bearers of a religion that was to remove the Cimmerian darkness which had so long bound the Irish Papists. We are told that Bale was sent over to labour among the Irish; that “he was an eager writer, and a learned and zealous man;” that he “*was* to be bishop of Ossory; that the archbishop of Dublin *intended* to have ordained him by the *old* pontifical, but he prevailed upon the archbishop to have the ceremony performed according to the *new* book of ordination;” that he went into his diocese; that he “found all there in *dark* Popery;” and that “before he could make any progress, the king’s death put an end to his designs.” The only authority we have for this very pretty relation is Gilbert Burnet, who produces no testimony to corroborate his statement. We believe it to be a fabrication, and it seems to carry with it its own confutation. Why not give us a few reasons which induced the archbishop to throw aside the ancient form and



adopt the new ceremonial? Why say that Bale *was* to be bishop, and then make him actually so? Why not *name* the two Irishmen, and the *sees* they were promoted to? And how lucky it was that death should take away the king, to save the credit of Bale. The modern editors, who have copied, or rather selected, their account of "the progress of the Reformation" from Burnet, make a little free, we see, with their authority, in order to suit their own purposes of deception. Burnet says, that Bale "was a busy writer, and a learned, zealous man, *but did not write with that temper and DECENCY that became a divine.*" This latter part of his character the modern editors have SUPPRESSED. Father Parsons, the able and learned detector of Fox's lies, informs us that this John Bale, for we suppose there was but one *learned* man of that name in those days, was an apostate friar, and chief gospeller in the times of Henry and Edward; and that he defended the *Jewish* custom of keeping Easter, in treating on a disputation between Colman, the Scottish bishop, and St. Wilfred, the English abbot, in a council held in Northumberland, in the year 664. Parsons proves Bale guilty of misrepresentation, falsehood, and scurrility, and quotes his own words to shew that he was a jester. "I have," says Bale, "written jests and pastimes without any certain number."—(*Bal. cent. v. descript. Brit.*) He is also represented by the same grave authority, as taking an active part in the contention between the lord protector, Somerset, and the lord high admiral, and their wives, before noticed, in which dispute many other apostate friars, and among the rest, Hugh Latimer, were great sticklers. Latimer inveighed, with much bitterness, in his sermons, against the admiral; and, on the other side, John Bale took the part of the admiral's wife, queen Catharine, whom he set forth, in his book before quoted, as one of the miracles of womankind.

So respectable a divine as John Bale must have performed wonders in enlightening the darkness of Ireland, had Providence thought it wise to prolong the life of the young pope.

But allowing this Bale to have been what he is here represented by the modern editors, of what use could his writings be to a people who could not *read*, and, if they could, were not acquainted with the language of his writings? In what way could an Englishman convert the Irish from their ancient faith, unless he had the gift of tongues, and was able to preach to them in their native language? And here we may be allowed to remark the inconsistency of these pretended reformers in regard to their propagating the newly invented forms and doctrines in Ireland. One of the charges brought by them against the Catholic church was, that she kept the people in ignorance by praying in a language which they did not understand, and consequently one of their first measures of *reform* was to have the liturgy in the English language. For the natives of Jersey and Guernsey a French translation was made; but it does not seem to have entered the heads of the reformers that the Irish required to have an edition in their own language. If it were necessary that the English should have the benefit of a form of worship in their own tongue, had not the king's subjects in Ireland an equal right to the same benefit? But strange to say, the very men who reproached the Catholic church with performing her service in a foreign language, issued a proclamation, by which the Irish were commanded to attend the English church service in a language they did not understand. The result was, that in Dublin, where the English language was somewhat familiar, Brown, the archbishop of Dublin, and four of his brethren, yielded submission to the order; but Dowdal, archbishop of Armagh, and the other prelates, stoutly resisted the decree, and the ancient service was retained, and has been preserved almost universally to this day. The modern editors say, "Goodaere was made *primate* of Armagh;" but this is another mistake or wilful misrepresentation of an historical fact. Dowdal, for his adherence to the faith of which he was appointed a guardian, was persecuted by the government, who took from him the *title* of *primate* of all Ireland, and transferred it, not to his successor

in the see of Armagh, but to his more servile brother, the archbishop of Dublin. Dowdal was obliged to fly the realm, but recovered his see on the accession of Mary.

The sacrilegious and infamous robberies of the churches in Ireland, begun by the reformers in Edward's reign, met, of course, a check by the succession of his sister Mary. She, however, was no sooner dead, and her place occupied by that *virgin* lady, who is called by the base writers the "good queen Bess," though a more merciless tyrant never wielded a sceptre, than the work of devastation was again resumed, and carried to a pitch that was never exceeded by the Goths and Vandals in their inroads on Christian kingdoms. We will here give the testimony of Spencer, Sydney, Hooker, Davies, and Strafford, who lived in the time of the transactions described, and which embraced a period of seventy years, commencing in 1560 and ending in 1630. From these witnesses the reader will learn the gross abuses practised by the newly established church, the complete neglect of duty by the bishops, and the utter want of persons to supply the churches, or the appointment of illiterate incumbents of the most dissolute morals.

Leland writes: "The clergy, who refused to conform, abandoned their cures. *No reformed ministers could be found to supply their places. The churches fell to ruins. The people were left without any religious worship or instruction.*" —(Vol. ii. p. 174.)

"The prejudices conceived against the Reformation, by the Irish natives more especially, were still further increased by the conduct of those who were commissioned to remove the objects and instruments of popular superstition. *Under pretence of obeying the orders of state, they seized all the most valuable furniture of the churches, which they exposed to sale without decency or reserve.* The Irish annalists pathetically describe the garrison of Athlone issuing forth, with a barbarous and heathen fury, and pillaging the famous church of Clonmacnoise, tearing away the most inoffensive ornaments, books, bells, plate, windows, furniture of every

kind, so as to leave the shrine of their favourite saint, Kieran, a hideous monument of sacrilege.”—(*Ibid.* 237.)

Spencer writes: “Some of them (the bishops) whose diocesses are in remote parts, somewhat out of the world’s eye, *doe not at all bestow the benefices, which are in their owne donation, upon any, but keep them in their owne hands, and set their owne servants and horse-boys to take up the tithes and fruites of them, with the which, some of them purchase great lands, and build faire castels upon the same.* Of which abuse if any question be moved, they have a very seemly colour and excuse, that they have no worthy ministers to bestow upon them, but keepe them so bestowed for any such sufficient person as any shall bring unto them.”—(p. 140.)

“Whatever disorders you see in the church of England, yee may finde there, and many more. Namely, *grosse simony, greedy covetousnesse, fleshly incontineney, carelesse sloath, and generally all disordered life in the common clergymen.* And besides all these, they have their particular enormities; for all Irish priests, which now enjoy the church livings, *they are in a manner meere laymen*, saving that they have taken holy orders; but otherwise they doe goe and live like laymen; follow all kinde of husbandry, and other worldly affaires, as other Irishmen doe. *They neither read scriptures, nor preach to the people, nor administer the communion; baptisme they doe, for they christen yet after the Popish fashion; only they take the tithes and offerings, and gather what fruite else they may of their livings.*”—(p. 139.)

“It is great wonder to see the oddes which is between the zeale of Popish priests, and the ministers of the gospell; for they spare not to come out of Spaine, from Rome, and from Remes, by long toyle and daungerous travayling hither; where they know perill of death awayteth them, and no reward or richesse is to be found, onely to draw the people unto the church of Rome; whereas some of our idle ministers, having a way for credite and estimation thereby opened unto them, and having the livings of the countrey offered unto them, without paines, and without perill, will neither for

the same, nor any love of God, nor zeale of religion, or for all the good they may doe, by winning soules to God, bee drawne foorth from their warme neastes, to looke out into God's harvest, which is even ready for the sickle, and all the fields yellow long agoe."—(p. 254.)

Sydney writes thus:—"The first is, the church is nowe so spoyled, as well by the ruine of the temples, as the discipacion and imbeaseling of the patrimonye, and most of all, for want of sufficient ministers; as *so deformed and over throwen a church there is not, I am sure, in any region where Christ is professed*; and preposterous it seameth to me, to begin reformation of the pollitique parte, and to neglect the religious."—(Vol. i. p. 109.)

"I was advertized of the perticuler estate of eeh church in the bishopricke of Meithe (being the best inhabited countrie of all this realme), by the honest, zealous, and learned bishop of the same, Mr. Hugh Brayde, a godlye minister of the gospell, and a good sarvaunt to your highnes, who went from church to church hym selfe, and found that there are within his diocess 224 parrishe churches, *of which number one hundred and five are impropriated to sondrie possessions nowe of your highnes*, and all leased out for yeares, or in fee farme, to severall farmers, and great gayne reaped out of theim above the rent, which your majestie receiveth; *no parson or vicar, resident upon any of theim, and a very simple or sorrye curat*, for the most parte, appointed to serve theim: amonge which number of curatts, *onely eightene were founde able to speake English*."—(p. 112.)

"No one howse standinge for any of theim to dwell in. In maney places, the very walles of the churches doune; verie few chauncells covered, wyndowes and dores ruyned or spoyled. There are 52 other parishe churches in the same diocess, who have viccars, indued upon theim, better served and mayntained then the other, yet but badlye. There are 52 parishe churches more, residue of the first number of 224, which pertaine to dyvers perticuler lords, and these, though in better estate then the rest commonlye are, yet farre from



well. *If this be the estate of the church in the best peopled diocess, and best governed countrie, of this your realme* (as in troth it is): easye it is for your majestie to conjecture, in what case the rest is, where little or no reformation, either of religion or manners, hath yet bene planted, and contynued amonge them.”—(*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 112.)

“Upon the face of the earthe, where Christ is professed, there is not a church in so miserable a case; the misery of whiche consisteth in these three particulars, the ruine of the verie temples themselves; the want of good mynisters to serve in them, when they shall be reedified; competent lyvinge for the ministers being wel chosen.”—(*Ibid.*)

“And though the outrages in the civil government were great, yet nothing to be compared to the ecclesiasticle state, for that was too far out of order, the temples all ruined, *the parish churches for the most part without curates and pastors, no service said, no God honoured, nor Christ preached, nor sacraments ministered.*”—(Hooker, apud Hollinshed, vol. vi. p. 352.)

“There has been so little care taken, as that the greatest part of the churches within the pale be still in their ruins; so as the common people (whereof many, without doubt, would conform themselves) *have no place to resort to, where they may hear divine service.*”—(Davies, p. 240.)

“For the holding of two livings, and but two with cure, since you approve me in the substance, I will yield to you in the circumstance of time. Indeed, my lord, *I knew it was bad, very bad in Ireland; but that it was so stark nought I did not believe, six benefits not able to find the minister cloths. In six parishes scarce six to come to church.*”—(Strafford, vol. i. p. 254.)

“The best entrance to the cure will be clearly to discover the state of the patient, which I find many ways distempered; *an unlearned clergy, who have not so much as the outward form of churchmen to cover themselves with, nor their persons any ways revered or protected; the churches unbuilt, the parsonage and vicarage houses utterly ruined;*

*the people untaught, through the non-residency of the clergy, occasioned by the unlimited shameful numbers of spiritual promotions with cure of souls, which they hold by commendams; the rites and ceremonies of the church run over without all decency of habit, order, or gravity, in the course of their service; the possessions of the church, to a great proportion, in lay hands; the bishops aliening their very principal houses and demesnes to their children, to strangers, farming out their jurisdictions to mean and unworthy persons; the Popish titulars exercising the whilst a foreign jurisdiction much greater than theirs.*"—(*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 187.)

"There are seven or eight ministers in each diocess, of good sufficiency, and (which is no small cause of the continuance of the people in Popery still) English, which have not the tongue of the people, nor can perform any divine offices, or converse with them; and which hold, many of them, two or three, four or more vicarages apiece; even the clerkships themselves are in like manner conferred upon the English, and sometimes two or three or more upon one man, and ordinarily bought and sold, or let to farm."—(*Burnet's Life of Bedell*, p. 46.)

"As scandalous livings naturally make scandalous ministers, the clergy of the established church were generally ignorant and unlearned, loose and irregular in their lives and conversations, negligent of their cures, and very careless of observing uniformity and decency in divine worship."—(*Carte*, vol. i. p. 68.)

"Nor were the parochial churches in a better condition than the cathedral. They had most of them in the country been destroyed in the troubles, or fallen down for want of covering; the livings were very small, and either kept in the bishops' hands by way of commendams and sequestrations, or else filled with ministers as scandalous as their income; so that scarce any care was taken to catechise the children, or instruct others in the grounds of religion; and for years together, divine service had not been used in any parish church throughout Ulster, except in some city or principal towns."—(*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 17.)

“There were few churches to resort to; few teachers to exhort and instruct; fewer still who could be understood; and *almost all, at least for the greater part of this reign (Elizabeth's) of scandalous insufficiency.*”—(Leland, vol. ii. p. 459.)

We are indebted to the researches of Mr. Carey, of Philadelphia, for these extracts, which we have taken from his able and valuable work, entitled, *Vindiciæ Hibernicæ; or, Ireland Vindicated*, in which he has most feelingly and forcibly pourtrayed the horrible barbarities and outrages which marked the blood-stained progress of the Reformation in Ireland. Our blessed Saviour told his disciples that the tree would be known by its fruits; pernicious, then, must that tree have been which produced such fruits as are here described. And yet we have men in the nineteenth century—in an age that boasts of its learning and enlightenedness—extolling this work of devastation and slaughter as the offspring of Heaven! Was ever such blasphemy and impiety before known?

## ACCESSION OF QUEEN MARY.

SUBVERSION OF RELIGION, AND PERSECUTIONS OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND, DURING HER REIGN.

This is the most interesting period of the work we are reviewing, and we beg the serious attention of the reader to it. Under the above head the modern editors of Fox have introduced the following account of the accession of Mary to the throne of her father and brother. We give the whole of it, that we may not be accused of partiality, as it will be our duty to detect and expose the barefaced falsehoods, and the many misrepresentations of historical facts it contains. The editors say:—

“We now call the attention of the British Protestants to a period of their church history that cannot fail to awaken in their hearts that love for their ancestors, which at present, we fear, lies dormant in too many. A long career of ease appears to have obliterated from their minds the troubles of their generous forefathers, who, for them, bled in every vein—for them, were consigned to the devouring flames in every part of the country; preparing and establishing for their descendants, by the sacrifice of themselves, political and religious liberty. And while we behold, with gratitude and admiration, the effects of their noble self-devotion, let us thence learn to appreciate those blessings which, by the continued providence of God, we have so long enjoyed; and let us be confirmed more and more in our determination to resist every attempt, whether by open force or secret fraud, to deprive us and our descendants of the privileges so dearly purchased.

“It has been asserted by the Roman Catholics, ‘That all those who suffered death, during the reign of queen Mary, had been adjudged guilty of high treason, in consequence of their rising in defence of lady Jane Grey’s title to the crown.’ To disprove this, however, is no difficult matter, since every one conversant in English history must know, that those who are found guilty of high treason are to be hanged and quartered. But how can even a Papist affirm, that ever a man in England was *burned* for high trea-

son? We admit, that some few suffered death in the ordinary way of process at common law, for their adherence to lady Jane; but none of those were burned. Why, if traitors, were they taken before the bishops, who have no power to judge in criminal cases? Even allowing the bishops to have had power to judge, yet their bloody statute did not empower them to execute. The proceedings against the martyrs are still extant, and they are carried on directly according to the forms prescribed by their own statute. Not one of those who were burned in England was ever accused of high treason, much less were they tried at common law. And this should teach the reader to value a history of transactions in his own country, particularly as it relates to the sufferings of the blessed martyrs in defence of the religion he professes, in order that he may be able to remove the veil which falsehood has cast over the face of truth. Having said thus much, by way of introduction, we shall proceed with the Acts and Monuments of the British Martyrs.

“By the death of king Edward the crown devolved, according to law, on his elder sister Mary, who was within half a day’s journey to the court, when she had notice given her by the earl of Arundel of her brother’s death, and of the patent for lady Jane’s succession. Upon this she retired to Framlingham, in Suffolk, to be near the sea, that she might escape to Flanders, in case of necessity. Before she arrived there, she wrote, on the 9th of July, to the council, telling them, that ‘she understood, that her brother was dead, by which she succeeded to the crown, but wondered that she heard not from them; she well understood what consultation they had engaged in, but she would pardon all such as would return to their duty, and proclaim her title to the crown.’

“It was now found, that the king’s death could be no longer kept a secret; accordingly some of the privy council went to lady Jane, and acknowledged her as their queen. The news of the king’s death afflicted her much, and her being raised to the throne rather increased than lessened her trouble. She was a person of extraordinary abilities, acquirements, and virtues. She was mistress both of the Greek and Latin tongues, and delighted much in study. As she was not tainted with the levities which usually accompany her age and station, so she seemed to have attained to the practice of the highest fortitude; for in those sudden turns of her condition, as she was not exalted with the prospect of a crown, so she was little cast down, when her palace was made her prison. The only passion she shewed was that of the noblest kind, in the concern she expressed for her father and husband, who fell with her, and seemingly on her account; though, in reality, Northumberland’s ambition and her father’s weakness ruined her.



“She rejected the crown, when it was first offered her ; she said, she knew that of right it belonged to the late king’s sisters, and therefore could not with a good conscience assume it ; but she was told, that both the judges and privy counsellors had declared, that it fell to her according to law. This, joined with the importunities of her husband, her father, and father-in-law, made her submit. Upon this, twenty-one privy counsellors set their hands to a letter to Mary, telling her that queen Jane was now their sovereign, and that as the marriage between her father and mother had been declared null, so she could not succeed to the crown ; they therefore required her to lay down her pretensions, and to submit to the settlement now made ; and if she gave a ready obedience, promised her much favour. The day after this they proclaimed Jane.

“Northumberland’s known enmity to the late duke of Somerset, and the suspicions of his being the author of Edward’s untimely death, begot a great aversion in the people to him and his family, and disposed them to favour Mary ; who, in the meantime, was very active in raising forces to support her claim. To attach the Protestants to her cause, she promised not to make any change in the reformed worship, as established under her brother ; and on this assurance a large body of the men of Suffolk joined her standard.

“Northumberland was now perplexed between his wish to assume the command of an army raised to oppose Mary, and his fear of leaving London to the government of the council, of whose fidelity he entertained great doubts. He was, however, at length obliged to adopt the latter course, and before his departure from the metropolis, he adjured the members of the council, and all persons in authority, to be steadfast in their attachment to the cause of queen Jane, on whose success, he assured them, depended the continuance of the Protestant religion in England. They promised all he required, and he departed, encouraged by their protestations and apparent zeal.

“Mary’s party in the mean time continued daily to augment. Hastings went over to her with 4000 men out of Buckinghamshire, and she was proclaimed queen in many places. At length the privy council began to see their danger, and to think how to avoid it ; and besides fears for their personal safety, other motives operated with many of the members. To make their escape from the Tower, where they were detained, ostensibly to give dignity to the court of queen Jane, but really as prisoners, they pretended it was necessary to give an audience to the foreign ambassadors, who would not meet them in the Tower ; and the earl of Pembroke’s house was appointed for the audience.

“When they met there they resolved to declare for queen Mary, and rid themselves of Northumberland’s yoke, which they knew they

must bear, if he were victorious. They sent for the lord mayor and aldermen, and easily gained their concurrence ; and Mary was proclaimed queen on the 19th of July. They then sent to the Tower, requiring the duke of Suffolk to quit the government of that place, and the lady Jane to lay down the title of queen. To this she submitted with much greatness of mind, and her father with abjectness.

“ The council next sent orders to Northumberland to dismiss his forces, and to obey the queen. When Northumberland heard this, he disbanded his forces, went to the market-place at Cambridge, where he then was, and proclaimed Mary as queen. The earl of Arundel was sent to apprehend him, and when Northumberland was brought before him, he, in the most servile manner, fell at his feet to beg his favour. He, with three of his sons, and Sir Thomas Palmer (his wicked tool in the destruction of the duke of Somerset), were all sent to the Tower.

“ Every one now flocked to implore the queen’s favour, and Ridley among the rest, but he was committed to the Tower ; the queen being resolved to put Bonner again in the see of London. Some of the judges, and several noblemen, were also sent thither, among the rest the duke of Suffolk ; who was, three days after, set at liberty. He was a weak man, could do little harm, and was consequently selected as the first person towards whom the queen should exert her clemency.

“ Mary came to London on the 3rd of August, and on the way was met by her sister, lady Elizabeth, with a thousand horse, whom she had raised to assist the queen. On arriving at the Tower, she liberated the Duke of Norfolk, the duchess of Somerset, and Gardiner ; also the lord Courtney, son to the marquis of Exeter, who had been kept there ever since his father’s attainder, and whom she now made earl of Devonshire.

“ Thus was seated on the throne of England the lady Mary, who, to a disagreeable person and weak mind, united bigotry, superstition, and cruelty. She seems to have inherited more of her mother’s than her father’s qualities. Henry was impatient, rough, and ungovernable ; but Catherine, while she assumed the character of a saint, harboured inexorable rancour and hatred against the Protestants. It was the same with her daughter Mary, as appears from a letter in her own handwriting, now in the British Museum. In this letter, which is addressed to bishop Gardiner, she declares her fixed intention of burning every Protestant ; and there is an insinuation, that as soon as circumstances would permit, she would restore back to the church the lands that had been taken from the convents. This was the greatest instance of her weakness that she could shew : for in the first place the convents had been all demolished, except a few of their

churches; and the rents were in the hands of the first nobility, who, rather than part with them, would have overturned the government both in church and state.

"Mary was crowned at Westminster in the usual form; but dreadful were the consequences that followed. The narrowness of spirit which always distinguishes a weak mind from one that has been enlarged by education, pervaded all the actions of this princess. Unacquainted with the constitution of the country, and a slave to superstition, she thought to domineer over the rights of private judgment, and trample on the privileges of mankind. The first exertion of her regal power was to wreak her vengeance upon all who had supported the title of lady Jane Grey.

"The first of these was the duke of Northumberland, who was beheaded on Tower-hill, and who, in consequence of his crimes, arising from ambition, died unpitied; nay, he was even taunted on the scaffold by the spectators, who knew in what manner he had acted to the good duke of Somerset.

"The other executions that followed were numerous indeed, but as they were all upon the statute of high treason, they cannot, with any degree of propriety, be applied to Protestants, or, as they were then called, *heretics*. The parliament was pliant enough to comply with all the queen's requests, and an act passed to establish the Popish religion. This was what the queen waited for, and power being now put into her hands, she was determined to exercise it in the most arbitrary manner. She was destitute of human compassion, and without the least reluctance could tyrannize over the consciences of men.

"This leads us to the conclusion of the first year of her reign; and we consider it the more necessary to take notice of these transactions, although not, strictly speaking, *martyrdoms*, that our readers might be convinced of the great difference there is between dying for religion and for high treason. It is history alone that can teach them such things, and it is reflection only that can make history useful. We frequently read without reflection, and study without consideration; but the following portions of our history, in particular, will furnish ample materials for serious thought to our readers, and we entreat their attention to them."

This account is in part emitted from the pericraniums of the modern editors, and in other part selected from the *Abridgment of Burnet's History*. The exordium is genuine, and a delectable specimen of Protestant veracity it is. The attention of British Protestants is called to "a period of their

*church* history that cannot fail to awaken in their hearts that love for their ancestors, which at present [they say] we fear, lies dormant in too many." Yes, we believe it; the "devouring flames" so long fanned by lying historians begin to smoulder, and we are happy to say there is not an appearance that any efforts of bigotry will succeed in rekindling the dying embers. The modern editors talk of the sacrifices made by their ancestors in favour of political and religious liberty; but where are we to go for proofs of this spirit of patriotism? If we look into the pages of history, we see nothing but factious contentions and persecutions of the weaker by the stronger party. We see the church-ascendancy party persecuting those who dissent from her; we see the Puritan covenanters breathing nothing but fire and fury against church of England men; then the Independents succeeded and persecuted the Puritans; while the poor Papists were the victims of every faction. If we examine the statute book, we shall find that penal laws kept increasing in every succeeding reign; and as every penal law must be a restriction on the freedom of every one affected by it, the share of liberty now enjoyed by Englishmen is merely nominal, and therefore it is no wonder that they are so backward in listening to the warwhoop of hot-headed fanatics. The sensible Protestant is not now to be deluded by the empty boastings of imaginary blessings under a Protestant system, which takes away more than one-third of the profits of the labourer to bestow them upon a set of lazy and wealthy sinecurists, pensioners, and half-pay officers, composed in a great measure of the sons of parsons and bastards of the nobility. He has now no relish for that system which upholds a rich and idle clergy in some measure without flocks, and careless whether those that remain secede to some neighbouring dissenting congregation. He is too well aware that the blessings which the Catholic labourer really enjoyed before the Reformation are never tasted by him, since he has to plod and toil every day to increase the luxuries of others, whereas the Catholic, having only to labour for himself and his family, did not want to toil

incessantly through the week, but had frequent days of rest, which were spent in devotion and mirthful recreation. Under these circumstances, when men in these days talk of privileges dearly purchased, and preserving them against force or fraud, they should have the decency to tell us what privileges are enjoyed, and likely to be wrested from them; where they are to be found, and by whom held.

The editors next tell us, "It has been asserted by the Roman Catholics, 'That *all* those who suffered death, during the reign of queen Mary, had been adjudged guilty of high treason, in consequence of their rising in defence of lady Jane Grey's title to the crown;'" and they then proceed to prove the falsity of this assertion by some curious logic. But the statement is itself *false*, and therefore requires no refutation. Why did they not *name* the Catholic who made the assertion? Because they could not. Again, they say: "Not *one* of those who were burned in England was ever accused of high treason, much less were they tried at common law." Now this is another barefaced falsehood, for the most prominent character who suffered, and of whom we shall have to say much hereafter, namely, Tom Cranmer, was not only *accused* of high treason, but was actually *tried* and *condemned* for *that crime*, on the 14th of September, 1553, according to the testimony of Dr. Heylin. Ridley was sent to the Tower also on the same charge. So much for the accuracy of the modern editors.

Before we enter into the transactions of this short but interesting reign, we must notice another vile insinuation which the modern editors have cast on the memory of Mary's mother, the unfortunate but magnanimous Catharine. Describing, or rather professing to describe, the qualities of Mary, these unfeeling bigots say: "She seems to have inherited more of her mother's than her father's qualities. Henry was impatient, rough, and ungovernable [fine qualities for a Protestant pope]; but Catharine, while she assumed the character of a saint, harboured inexorable rancour and hatred against the Protestants. It was the same with her daughter



Mary, as appears from a letter in her own handwriting, now in the British Museum. In this letter, which is addressed to bishop Gardiner, she declares *her fixed intention of burning every Protestant.*" What unblushing assertors of falsehood! We might have supposed that the lies we have detected from the writings of Fox and Burnet would have contented these modern editors, without adding diabolical inventions of their own, which stand refuted by every historian of credit and respectability. But what can be expected from men, who, in their preface to this *Book of Lies*, thus speaks of our Review of it. "But a few weeks," they say, "had elapsed from our first publication, when the enemies of the Protestant religion, alarmed at the sensation created by our work, set their usual engines in motion, and announced a *Review*, of what they are pleased to term *Fox's Book of Lies*. Accordingly, in due time, this notable performance made its appearance; and although it is, as might be expected, a mass of vulgar abuse, gross perversion, barefaced falsehoods, and unsupported assertions, yet, such is the influence exercised by the Popish priests over the deluded and ignorant creatures whom they pretend to *teach*, that the publication still continues, and a sufficient number are disposed of to defray the expenses, and to pay the wages of the miserable hack who puts together this farrago of trash, destined (as he *modestly* says) to *enlighten the Catholic world!*

"It may naturally be inquired, if this book be so utterly unworthy, how does it meet with purchasers? To this we reply, those who purchase it, are *compelled* to do so; it is a kind of *act of faith*, enjoined by the priests, and, of course, submitted to by their flocks, with the same willingness (though with *less pleasure*) as they would, had they the power, perform a real, Inquisitorial *Auto da Fe*, in which the editors of the *Book of Martyrs* should be consigned to the flames, amidst the savage yellings of the bigotted and infuriated multitude! That the sale of the *Review* among these poor creatures arises from a notion of its being necessary for the preservation of their souls from purgatory, and not

from any possibility of amusement or instruction to be derived from its perusal, is evident from the fact, that *three-fourths* of its 'enlightened' purchasers are not sufficiently skilful to *read* it; and of the remaining fourth, if ten persons were to come forward and swear that they had read this *erudite* performance through, we should certainly suspect that the *dispensing* power of his 'Holiness' had been exerted to relieve their *consciences* from the guilt of *perjury*. We have ourselves tried to wade through it, and are confident that it would be almost impossible to persevere through two pages, such is the soporific dulness of the matter, were it not that the attention is ever and anon aroused by a daring excursion beyond the bounds of truth, or, to speak in plain terms, a *shameless and outrageous falsehood!* Sincerely do we pity those who can be imposed on by so gross an imposture; and we consider ourselves, and the cause we have espoused, doubly honoured by this attack; for while the abuse and impotent malignity levelled at our work, from such a quarter, is its highest eulogium, the countenance afforded to our adversary by the Papist, is the best proof of the veracity of our assertions as to the ignorance and besotted bigotry of the present, as well as former, professors of that belief. This is the *first* and *last* notice we shall ever take of this work, although we are *personally* abused in almost every one of its pages. The intolerant and malignant spirit displayed throughout the whole should be an additional inducement to Protestants to guard against the possibility of power being intrusted to such persons as the patrons of the *Review*."

We have here a specimen of the sectarian art of lying, only to be equalled by the gullibility of those who give credence to such monstrous assertions. Are the editors and publishers—are the patronizers of such outrageous violations of common sense and decency—in sane mind? Or are they not rather fit candidates for Bedlam? To charge us with "*personally*" abusing *anonymous* scribblers is paying no great compliment to the sapiency of *their* readers; and to assert that *three-fourths* of the *purchasers* of our *Review*

cannot *read* it, and those who can *do not*, though they continue to encourage it, is stretching even beyond the capacity of Munchausen. But the priests *compel* them to purchase! Do they, and for what? Merely for the sake, we suppose, of paying us wages for rendering no service, since no one, according to their account, reads the *Review*. Admiral logicians! you have here shewn your capacity for the trade of falsehood not to be surpassed by Fox himself, and from our hearts we PITY, most SINCERELY do we PITY, those poor deluded mortals, whose want of penetration and blind credulity subject them to such gross and abominable impositions.

But we must return to the subject from which we have digressed. The ill-fated Catharine, the modern editors say, “harboured inexorable rancour and hatred against the Protestants!” Base libellers of a suffering queen and virtuous woman! where is your authority for this infamous accusation? Even Burnet stands to confront you in this falsehood, for he says “she was a devout and exemplary woman;” that “she used to work with her own hands, and kept her women at work with her;” that she practised severities and devotions, and gave almsdeeds; and that *all sorts* of people had a high esteem of her; and you have acknowledged his testimony in the preceding pages of your work. Catharine had too many misfortunes to afflict her, and was too helpless in her situation, to gratify the rancour you charge her with, had she even entertained it; but this charge springs from the malice and rancour of your own hearts against Papists and Popery, which is manifest in every line of your work. Again, we ask you on what authority do you state that there is a letter in the handwriting of Mary, deposited in the British Museum, in which she declares her fixed intention of burning every Protestant? By whom was it deposited? Who vouches for the handwriting? To whose possession can it be traced before the Museum obtained possession of it? These questions must be answered, modern editors, before the sensible part of the community will believe you; but this you will never do, because it is out of your power. Anticipating these awkward

difficulties, you very wisely announce in your preface that the only notice you will take of the detections of your base falsehoods is the rodomontade we have just quoted. But if Mary was so firmly fixed in her cruel intentions towards Protestants, how came Burnet to tell us that she declared in council, on the 22nd of August, 1553, "that though she was fixed in her own religion, YET SHE WOULD NOT COMPEL OTHERS TO IT; but would leave that to the motions of God's spirit, and *the labours of good preachers.*" This does not look like "a fixed intention of burning every Protestant." That Mary had "more of her mother's than her father's qualities" we do not deny; but they were qualities the very opposite to those which are imputed to her by the modern editors. We know that Protestants have been taught from their infancy to look upon this princess as a woman of sanguinary disposition, and we never hear her name pronounced without the epithet of "bloody" prefixed to it; but we shall shew that Protestant historians, who, having soared above the vulgar prejudices of education, have calmly considered the circumstances of her reign, have done justice to her memory. Collier, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, says: "It may be affirmed, without panegyric, that the queen's private life was all along strait and unblemished. It must be said that religion had the overbalance: the other world was uppermost with her, and she valued her conscience more than her crown....That she was not of a vindictive implacable spirit may be inferred from her pardoning most of the great men in Northumberland's rebellion."—Vol. ii. b. 6. p. 400. Camden, in his introduction to the *Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, writes: "A princess never to be sufficiently commended for her pious and religious demeanour, her commiseration towards the poor, and her magnificence and liberality towards the nobility and churchmen."—p. 10. Echard says: "She was a woman of a strict and severe life: who allowed herself few of those diversions belonging to courts: was constant at her devotions, &c.... She much endeavoured to expiate and restore the sacrileges of the two last reigns."—p. 327. Fuller, in his *Church*

*History*, states, that “She hated to equivocate in her own religion; and always was what she was, without dissembling her judgment or practice for fear or flattery....She had been a worthy princess, had as little cruelty been done under her as was done by her.”—B. xiii. p. 42. Baker, in his *Chronicle*, says: “We shall not do her right, if we *deny her to be of a merciful disposition*, seeing oftentimes she pitied the *person* where she shed the *blood*.” With these testimonies in her favour, let the reader decide between Mary and the base libellers of her character. We shall now proceed to detail some of the most prominent events in her reign, which the modern editors have carefully and craftily suppressed; and when the reader has gone over our account, he will be able to say whether Mary was “unacquainted with the constitution of the country,” or whether she was not one of the most constitutional sovereigns that ever reigned over this once happy and Catholic country.

The reader has been already apprized of the design of Dudley, duke of Northumberland, to set aside the two sisters of the young king Edward, and get the lady Jane Grey, the wife of his son, lord Dudley, exalted to the throne. This young lady was daughter to the duke of Suffolk, who was the son of Mary, sister to Henry VIII., by Charles Brandon, whom she married on the death of her husband, Louis XII., king of France, and who was afterwards created duke of Suffolk. The pretext for transferring the crown from the rightful heir to that of a pretender was that of religion, it being well known that Mary was rigidly attached to the Catholic faith, and the chief reformers therefore saw that if she came to the throne there was little chance for them to come off scot free. Accordingly, they worked upon the feelings of the young and weakly sovereign and prevailed upon him to sign an instrument, whereby the crown was conferred upon lady Jane, contrary to the constitutional privileges of parliament, which was not consulted on the occasion. The young king did not live more than a fortnight after signing this instrument, and every means were used to keep his death



secret till Northumberland had got his projects into proper training ; but in this they were frustrated, as on the very night while the lords were sitting in council, the princess Mary was informed of the event, as well as the intentions of the conspirators. She was then at Hoddesdon, in the neighbourhood of London, and without losing a moment she mounted her horse and rode with her household servants to Kenninghall, in Norfolk. On the fourth day after the king's death, the same was announced to lady Jane, who was conveyed to the Tower in full state, and the next day proclaimed queen. The people heard the proclamation with silence : a vintner's boy had the hardihood to give his dissent, and the next day he lost his ears for his folly. The morning following, a letter from the princess Mary was delivered to the council, in which she assumed the style and dignity of the sovereign, reproached them with withholding from her the intelligence of her brother's death, intimated that she was acquainted with their disloyal intentions to oppose her rights, and commanded them to proclaim her accession to the throne immediately. This letter was dated from Kenninghall, the 9th of July, 1553 ; but the document seemed to give the traitors no uneasiness : they looked upon themselves safe, as Mary was but a single and defenceless woman, but they reckoned without their host. To this letter the lords in council returned an insulting answer, in which they upbraided her with illegitimacy, and called upon her to submit to their and her lawful sovereign, lady queen Jane, and abandon her false claim. This answer, the reader must bear in remembrance, was signed, in the first instance, by the hoary and lecherous old scoundrel, TOM CRANMER, and twenty other members of the council.

While these traitorous proceedings were concerting in the council, a different turn of affairs was going on abroad. The people knew nothing of lady Jane, but were not ignorant of the princess Mary and her rights. They hated Northumberland for his ambition, and there were strong suspicions that he had poisoned the young king to make way for his

daughter-in-law, who eventually might be made to yield the crown to the aspiring duke. The very day on which they sent their insolent letter to Mary, intelligence reached the council, that she had been joined by some of the nobility, and that the gentry and people of the neighbouring counties of her residence were flocking round her standard. This put the conspirators into dreadful alarm, and Northumberland found himself sadly perplexed. He saw the necessity of making head against Mary; but how could he leave the capital, where his presence was necessary to secure the fidelity of his colleagues. They, on the other hand, wished to gain a point of safety in case of a reverse of fortune. Northumberland proposed that the duke of Suffolk should command the forces destined against Mary, while the secret partisans of that princess urged the propriety of Northumberland's taking the command upon himself, as the most proper of the two, in consequence of his great skill, valour and good fortune. Northumberland found himself constrained to consent, though reluctantly, and he took leave of his colleagues with a heavy heart. As he rode through the city at the head of his troops, he found the street thronged with people, but heard no exclamations for success, on which he despondently remarked to Sir John Gates: "The people crowd to look upon us; but not one says, God speed ye!"

From the outset of these doings, Northumberland suspected the fidelity of the citizens of London, and therefore, before his departure, he requested the assistance of the preachers, and exhorted them to appeal from the pulpit in favour of the reformed faith and lady Jane's cause. "By no one," writes Dr. Lingard, "was the task performed with greater zeal than by Ridley, bishop of London, who, on the following Sunday, preached at St. Paul's Cross before the lord mayor, the aldermen, and a numerous assemblage of the people. He maintained that the daughters of Henry VIII. were, by the illegitimacy of their birth, excluded from the succession. He contrasted the opposite characters of the present competitors, the gentleness, the piety, the orthodoxy, of the one, with the

haughtiness, the foreign connections, and the Popish creed, of the other. As a proof of Mary's bigotry, he narrated a chivalrous but unsuccessful attempt which he had made within the last year, to withdraw her from the errors of Popery: and, in conclusion, he conjured the audience, as they prized the pure light of the gospel, to support the cause of the lady Jane, and to oppose the claim of her idolatrous rival. But the torrent of his eloquence was poured in vain." As Ridley's attempt to make a convert of the princess Mary, which he here alludes to in his sermon, is not without interest, we insert it for the amusement of the reader, who will not fail to perceive the mental superiority of Mary over the apostate prelate. "Ridley waited on Mary, September 8, 1552, and was courteously received. After dinner, he offered to preach before her in the church. She begged him to make the answer himself. He urged her again: she replied, that he might preach; but that neither she, nor any of hers, would hear him. *Ridley*: 'Madam, I trust you will not refuse God's word.' *Mary*: 'I cannot tell what you call God's word. That is not God's word now which was God's word in my father's time.' *Ridley*: 'God's word is all one in all times; but is better understood and practised in some ages than in others.' *Mary*: 'You durst not for your ears have preached that for God's word in my father's time, which you do now. As for your new books, thank God, I never read them, I never did, nor ever will do.' Soon afterwards she dismissed him with these words: 'My lord, for your gentleness to come and see me, I thank you; but for your offer to preach before me, I thank you not.' As he retired, he drank, according to custom, with Sir Thomas Wharton, the steward of her household; but suddenly his conscience smote him: 'Surely,' he exclaimed, 'I have done wrong. I have drunk in that house in which God's word hath been refused. I ought, if I had done my duty, to have shaken the dust off my shoes for a testimony against this house.'"—(*Fox*, ii. 131.)

Northumberland, before his departure, requested and obtained a commission, signed and sealed by the lords of the

council, at the head of which was Cranmer, in which were certain instructions, and the marches laid out and limited from one to another. Thus fortified, Northumberland set out for St. Edmund's Bury, where, instead of hearing of the supplies that were to be sent him, he received letters from some of the lords of the council, full of trouble and discomfort, which placed him between hope and despair. In the mean time, the princess Mary was not idle. She unexpectedly left Kenninghall for the castle of Framlingham, in Suffolk, a distance of forty miles, which she rode without rest. Here, in a few days, she found herself surrounded by more than thirty thousand men, all volunteers in her cause, who refused to receive pay, and served, to their immortal honour, through the sole motive of loyalty. An attempt has been made by Fox and the modern editors to stain Mary's character with having forfeited her word, but no proof whatever is produced to substantiate the charge. The latter say: "To attach the Protestants to her cause, she promised not to make any alteration in the reformed worship, as established under her brother; and, on this assurance, a large body of men of Suffolk joined her standard." This is another of the countless lies to be found in this mass of falsehoods. By the most unquestionable authority, it appears that Mary made no such promise. Dr. Heylin makes the earl of Arundel, in his speech to the lords of the council, thus allude to this matter: "Yet how doth it appear that the princess Mary intends any alteration in religion? Certainly, having been lately petitioned to on this point by the Suffolk men, she gave them a *very hopeful answer*." Here then it is clear there was no distinct promise made on the part of the queen, and therefore she could not be guilty of a breach of her word. Nay, Fox himself, like all other liars, bears witness to the falsity of his own statement. "During the persecution," observes Dr. Lingard, in a note to Mary's reign, "these very persons presented to the queen's commissioners a long petition in favour of their religion. It was certainly the time for them to have urged the promise, if any had been given. But they appear to have

no knowledge of any such thing. They do not make the remotest allusion to it. They speak, indeed, of their services : but instead of attributing them to the promise of the queen, they insinuate the contrary, by asserting that they supported her claim, because their religion taught them to support the rightful heir.”—(*Fox*, iii. 578-583.) Mr. Collier remarks : “If they engaged upon condition, and artieled with their sovereign, their caution went too far. For either she had a right, or she had none : if she had none, their correspondence was criminal ; if they believed she had a right, they ought to have run the risk of her government and served her without terms, and rested the event with Providence.” From all this testimony it is evident that Mary did not commit herself, but that she intended to leave all these matters to the wisdom and deliberation of parliament, as we shall hereafter shew.

This disposition of the people alarmed Northumberland and made him irresolute. The lords of the council too were by no means easy at the progress of Mary's cause. On the 18th of July, it was resolved to send for a body of mercenary slaves, raised in Picardy, and to levy troops in the vicinity of the metropolis ; but these measures were found too tardy, and on the day following, Mary was proclaimed queen at St. Paul's Cross, amidst the acclamations of the people, which drowned the voice of the herald. Thus ended the nine days' reign of lady Jane Grey. The lords of the council now sent an order to Northumberland to disband his forces and acknowledge Mary for his sovereign, but the duke had taken the only part which prudence suggested to save himself. He was at this time at Cambridge, and, sending for the vice-chancellor, he proceeded to the market-place, where, with tears running down his cheeks, he proclaimed Mary sovereign of England, and threw his cap into the air in token of joy. The next morning the duke was arrested by the earl of Arundel, on a charge of high treason, together with several of his associates, and conducted to the Tower. So incensed were the people at their disloyalty, that it required a strong guard to protect them from their vengeance. Bonfires, illuminations, and all



the customary demonstrations of public joy took place on the accession of Mary to the throne of her ancestors. On her public entrance into the metropolis, accompanied by her sister Elizabeth, their ears were stunned with the acclamations of the people, and when they entered the Tower, they found kneeling on the green, as state prisoners, the duchess of Somerset (widow of the late lord protector), the duke of Norfolk, the son of the late marquis of Exeter, and Gardiner, the deprived bishop of Winchester. The prelate pronounced a congratulatory address, and Mary was moved to tears. She bade them rise, and having kissed them, she set them at liberty. The same day she ordered a distribution of eight-pence to every poor householder in the city. Of the prisoners before mentioned, there were twenty-seven for trial; namely, the dukes of *Suffolk* and Northumberland; the marquis of Northampton; the earls of *Huntingdon* and Warwick; the lords *Robert, Henry, Ambrose, and Guilford Dudley* (sons of Northumberland); the lady Jane Dudley Grey (the pretended queen, and daughter of Suffolk); the archbishop of Canterbury (old Cranmer); the bishops of *London* (Ridley) and *Ely*; the lords *Ferrers, Clinton, and Cobham*; the judges *Montague, and Chomely*, and the *chancellor of the augmentations*; sirs Andrew Dudley, John Gates, Henry Gates, *Henry Palmer, John Cheke, John Yorke*, and Thomas Palmer; and *Dr. Cocks*. When the list was given to the queen, she struck out all the names in italics, and reduced the number from twenty-seven to eleven, which act of mercy cannot surely be construed into cruelty and vindictiveness of temper. Of the eleven thus left to be put upon their trial only seven were immediately tried: these were the duke of Northumberland, the chief contriver of the plot; the earl of Warwick, his son; the marquis of Northampton, sir John Gates, sir Henry Gates, sir Andrew Dudley, and sir Thomas Palmer, who had been Northumberland's principal counsellors and constant associates. Though urged to include the lady Jane Grey, who had been her rival, Mary would not listen to the proposal, and even undertook her defence, contending

that she was not an accomplice of Northumberland, but merely a puppet in his hands. Neither was the hoary old traitor, Cranmer, who had been the instrument of divorcing Mary's mother, had assisted to illegitimate the daughter, and afterwards did all he could to deprive her of the crown, included among the seven ; an astonishing instance of the lenity of Mary's disposition, and how much she acted on the charitable principles of that religion to which she was steadfastly fixed, and for which she had already suffered persecution herself.

On the 18th of August, the three noblemen, Northumberland, Warwick and Northampton, were brought before their peers, and pleaded guilty ; the first petitioned that mercy might be extended to his children, and requested an able divine to prepare him for death, and that he might be allowed to confer with two lords of the council on certain secrets of state, which had come to his knowledge while he was prime minister. To these requests Mary assented. The four commoners also pleaded guilty, but only Northumberland, Sir John Gates, and Sir Henry Palmer were ordered for execution. On the morning of their execution they attended a solemn mass, and were afterwards led out to the scaffold. The modern editors say that Northumberland died unpitied ; nay, that " he was even taunted on the scaffold by the spectators, who knew in what manner he had acted to the *good* duke of Somerset." From whom they borrowed this tale they do not tell us ; we conjecture it to be an invention of their own. Rapin, a Calvinist writer, speaks very strongly of the unpopularity of the duke for his haughtiness and cruelty, but we do not see any statement of his being taunted by the people at his death. That he was generally disliked there can be no doubt, and it is stated by Stow and Dr. Heylin, that when he and his fellow sufferers were on the way to execution, some words arose between them, each laying the blame of their treason on the other ; but afterwards they forgave each other, and died in mutual charity. That the modern editors have violated the truth we think is manifest,

as all historians agree that Northumberland, previous to suffering, addressed the spectators in a long speech, which he would not have done had they been in the temper described. After expatiating on the nature of his offence, and acknowledging his guilt, he concluded by admonishing the people, “to stand to the religion of their ancestors, rejecting that of later date, which *had occasioned all the misery of the foregoing thirty years*; and that for prevention for the future, if they desired to present their souls unspotted in the sight of God, and were truly affected to their country, they should expel those trumpets of sedition, the preachers of the reformed religion: that for himself, whatever had otherwise been pretended, he professed no other religion than that of his fathers, for testimony whereof he appealed to his good friend and ghostly father, the lord bishop of Worcester; and finally, that being blinded with ambition, he had been contented to make a wreck of his conscience by temporising, for which he professed himself a sincere repentant, and so acknowledged the justice of his death.” Thus fell the duke of Northumberland, another of the great actors in the tragedy of the Reformation. By Protestants his declaration as to religion is looked upon with suspicion; by Catholics his previous life is looked upon with detestation. He was the eldest son of that Dudley, who, with Empson, pillaged and oppressed the people under Henry VII., for which crimes they suffered under Henry VIII., and here we have the son of the first offender meeting an untimely end under Mary, the daughter of the last Henry, under strong suspicions of having poisoned the son of his greatest benefactor and sovereign. Heylin remarks, that though this duke had six sons, all of them living to be men, and all of them married, yet not one of them had lawful issue, as if, says the doctor, the curse of Jeconiah had been laid upon them.

Sir John Gates and Sir Henry Palmer both addressed the spectators before they were beheaded. The speech of the former, relating to bible reading, which is now the favourite project of the silly fanatics of the day, we will here give from

Stow, and recommend it to the careful perusal of those who are advocates for the indiscriminate circulation of the bible. They will here see the use made of the sacred word in the early days of what is called the Reformation, and history points out to us that it has been equally abused down to our own days. "My coming here this day," said Sir John, "is to die; whereof, I assure you all, I am well worthy: for I have lived as viciously and wickedly as any man hath done in the world. I was the greatest reader of scripture that might be, of a man of my degree; and a worse follower thereof there was not living. For I did not read to be edified thereby, nor to seek the glory of God: but contrariwise, arrogantly to be seditious, and dispute thereof: and privately to interpret it after my own brain and affection. Whereof, I exhort you all, to beware how, and after what sort you come to read God's holy word. For it is not a trifle, or playing-game, to deal with God's holy mysteries. Stand not too much in your own conceits. For like as a bee of one flower gathers honey, and the spider poison of the same: even so you, unless you humbly submit yourselves to God, and charitably read the same to the intent to be edified thereby, it is to you as poison, and worse; and it were better to let it alone."

The rest of the prisoners condemned were reprieved, and afterwards pardoned, so that only three individuals suffered the loss of life for this great conspiracy to deprive a princess of her throne. An act of clemency unparalleled in the history of the world, and yet this is the queen only known to Protestants as the "*bloody queen Mary*." On the 3rd of November following, the lady Jane Grey, with her husband the lord Guilford Dudley, his brother the lord Ambrose Dudley, and the pliable Tom Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, were brought to trial at the Guildhall, in London, on a charge of high treason, to which they all pleaded guilty, and submitted themselves to the queen's mercy. Sentence was passed upon them as a matter of course, but execution was stayed, and, in all probability, had not the lady Jane's father

again engaged in an insurrection to dethrone Mary, and Cranmer not issued seditious papers, neither of these prisoners would have been brought to execution. Stow tells us the lady Jane had the liberty of the Tower, to walk in the queen's garden and on the hill; and the lords Ambrose Dudley and Guilford Dudley had the liberties of the ports where they were lodged. Does this look like a cruel and bloody disposition?

We must return again to the modern editors, who, though they copy in a great measure from Burnet in this account of Mary's reign, have taken care to *suppress* every circumstance that would tell against the traitors or in favour of the libelled queen. They say: "Every one now flocked to implore the queen's mercy, and *Ridley* among the rest, but he was committed to the Tower; the queen being resolved to put Bonner again into the see of London." Burnet is more candid, for he adds, after "he was sent to the Tower; *for she was both offended with him* FOR HIS SERMON, and resolved to put Bonner," &c. The words in italics and small capitals, which bear materially on the case, inasmuch as they shew the *reason* why Ridley was committed, these instructors of Christian knowledge have wilfully suppressed. They have also omitted in their relation of the "Accession of Mary," the treasonable act of Ridley's preaching against Mary's right to the throne, and calling upon the people to rise in arms to oppose her, and support a pretender. Let us suppose that a Catholic bishop could have been found disloyal enough to have preached against the right of his present majesty to the throne of these realms, and when he found his treasonable practices abortive, throwing himself at the feet of the monarch to implore his favour: is any one so stupid as to imagine that he would obtain his request? Would not the modern editors be the loudest to call for his punishment? Mary sent Ridley to the Tower certainly, and had he received his deserts, he would have been immediately tried for his treason and sent to the scaffold along with Northumberland and his two associates. But Mary was lenient to the extreme, and to this clemency



of disposition we may attribute much of the inquietude she afterwards suffered in her government, as we shall soon prove.

We are next told, that Mary, on her way to London, "was met by her sister, lady Elizabeth, with a thousand horse, whom *she had raised to assist the queen.*" This is stated on the authority of Burnet, but Dr. Lingard gives a different version of Elizabeth's conduct. This able writer says: "The lady Elizabeth had taken no part in this contest. To a messenger, indeed, from Northumberland, who offered her a large sum of money, and a valuable grant of lands as the price of her voluntary renunciation of all right to the succession, she replied, that she had no right to renounce, as long as her elder sister was living. But, if she did not join the lady Jane, she did nothing in aid of the lady Mary. Under the excuse of a real or feigned indisposition, she confined herself to her chamber, that, whichever party proved victorious, she might claim the negative merit of non-resistance. Now, however, the contest was at an end; the new queen approached her capital, and Elizabeth deemed it prudent to court the favour of the conqueror. At the head of a hundred and fifty horse, she met her at Aldgate. They rode together in triumphal procession through the streets, which were lined with the different crafts in their gayest attire. Every eye was directed towards the royal sisters." So much for the veracity of Burnet and his copyists, as regards the sister of Mary; we must now point out another base falsehood, the invention of the modern editors, to injure the character of the queen. Alluding to the death of Northumberland, they say: "The other executions that followed were *numerous* indeed, but as they were all upon *the statute of high treason*, they cannot with any degree of propriety be applied to PROTESTANTS, or, as they were then called, *heretics.*" Of the persons engaged in the conspiracy to prevent Mary from ascending the throne, only the three before named were brought to execution, on her gaining the crown. All the others were either set at liberty or reprieved; no more

blood was shed during the first year of her reign, nor until a rebellion had been set on foot by the father of the late pretender, lady Jane, and Sir Thomas Wyatt, which had nearly cost Mary her crown and liberty too. But of this affair we shall have to treat more largely as we proceed. The modern editors would have their readers believe the whole reign of Mary was one of bloodshed and cruelty, whereas there were, as we have before said, only *three* executed in her first year, and there is every reason to believe, if the reformers had not been guilty of SEDITION and REBELLION, that no more would have suffered during her whole reign.

PROOFS OF MARY'S TOLERANT DISPOSITION, AND  
THE RESTLESS, SEDITIOUS SPIRIT OF THE FANATICAL  
REFORMERS.

We agree with the modern editors, that there is a very great difference "between dying *for religion* and for *high treason*." That "it is history alone that can teach them [their readers] such things, and it is reflection alone that can make history useful." But when we speak of history, we mean a plain and honest narration of FACTS, not a jumble of LIES and MISREPRESENTATIONS, such as these modern editors have dressed up from Fox and Burnet; perverting circumstances to mislead their readers, and suppressing others to prevent them from coming to a clear conviction of the truth. This is *not* history, and reflections on such productions only increase the mischief, by poisoning, instead of instructing, the mind. The editors of this *Book of Martyrs* say: "Mary was crowned at Westminster in the usual form, but *dreadful were the consequences that followed*. The *narrowness of spirit* which always distinguishes a *weak mind* from one that has been *enlarged by education*, pervaded *all* the actions of this princess. *Unacquainted with the constitution* of the country, and a *slave to superstition*, she sought to *domineer* over the *rights of private judgment*, and *trample* on the *privileges of mankind*. The first exertion of her regal power was, to *wreak vengeance* upon ALL

those who had supported the title of lady Jane Grey." And this, we suppose, these learned instructors of *their* readers call *history*. This is the sort of stuff that is to teach them the difference between dying for religion [*read* fanaticism] and high treason. Bless us! how wonderfully wise must that generation be that has to rely solely upon this kind of information for reflection to become useful members of society! We do not recollect meeting, even in this production of lies, such a string of falsehoods in so small a compass. If Mary did wreak her vengeance on all those who supported lady Jane, it must be admitted that her vengeance was soon satisfied, and partook more of mercy than of rancour. We have proved that of "all those" engaged in the support of lady Jane, only THREE suffered death, and even the father of the *ci-devant* queen was set at liberty. This is a kind of vengeance seldom practised by narrow minds, and could only arise from a heart filled with benevolence and compassion. That Mary possessed a noble mind, and was well educated, is incontestible, from the public proceedings in the early part of her reign; nor was she ignorant of the constitution of the country, as she governed only by constitutional measures, which we shall now proceed to shew.

Mary was proclaimed on the 19th of July, 1553; Northumberland was arrested on the 20th, and taken to the Tower on the 22nd. On the 31st the queen made her entrance into London, and immediately afterwards appointed her council, some of whom had been employed in offices of trust under her father, and had filled them faithfully. Of these, Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was made lord-chancellor on the 21st of September. On coming to the crown, Mary found herself in debt, from the policy of Northumberland, who had kept the officers of the state three years in arrear of their salaries; yet she issued two proclamations which drew upon her the applause and blessings of the whole people, with the exception of the rascally crew of evangelicals. "By the first," writes Dr. Lingard, "she restored a depreciated currency to its original value; ordered a new

coinage of sovereigns and half-sovereigns, angels and half-angels, of fine gold; and of silver groats, half-groats, and pennies, of the standard purity; and charged the whole loss and expense to the treasury. By the other, she remitted to her people, in gratitude for their attachment to her right, the subsidy of four shillings in the pound on land, and two shillings and eight-pence on goods, which had been granted to the crown by the late parliament. At the same time, she introduced, within the palace, an innovation highly gratifying to the younger branches of the nobility, though it forebode little good to the reformed preachers. Under Edward, their fanaticism had given to the court a sombre and funereal appearance. That they might exclude from it the pomps of the devil, they had strictly forbidden all richness of apparel, and every fashionable amusement. But Mary, who recollected with pleasure the splendid gaieties of her father's reign, appeared publicly in jewels and coloured silks; the ladies, emancipated from restraint, copied her example; and the courtiers, encouraged by the approbation of their sovereign, presumed to dress with a splendour that became their rank in the state. A new impulse was thus communicated to all classes of persons; and considerable sums were expended by the citizens in public and private decorations, preparatory to the coronation. That ceremony was performed after the ancient rite, by Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and was concluded, in the usual manner, with a magnificent banquet in Westminster-hall. The same day a general pardon was proclaimed, with the exception, by name, of sixty individuals who had been committed to prison, or confined to their own houses, by order of council, for treasonable or seditious offences committed since the queen's accession." These proceedings by no means exhibit an ignorance of the principles of the constitution, nor do they display a narrowness of mind, arising from a contracted education.

While these salutary proceedings were going on in the state, Mary was not unmindful of the affairs of the church. It must here be observed, that this princess was firmly

attached to the faith of her forefathers, and that the Catholic church, to which she belonged, was always unconnected with the state in all ecclesiastical matters. By the first clause in Magna Charta, it was stipulated that the church should be free, and secured in all her rights and privileges. These rights and privileges were invaded and destroyed by Mary's father and brother, when they robbed and despoiled the church of that property which she held in trust for the benefit of the poor, the sick, the stranger, the widowed, and the fatherless. When Mary ascended the throne she restored the church to her rights, and placed those bishops in their sees who had been illegally deposed from them, and expelled those who had been improperly thrust into their places. In doing this she proceeded as cautiously as she could, in order to avoid any excitation to tumult and confusion of the discontented fanatical party, who saw all their hopes lost while Mary was safely seated on the throne. But careful as she was, the seditious spirit of the evangelicals was too forward to be kept within the bounds of peace and good order. On the 13th of August, Dr. Bourn, the archdeacon of London, was grossly assaulted while preaching at St. Paul's cross, and a dagger was flung at his head. A riot was also occasioned by the celebration of mass in a church in the horse-market. These seditious and disorderly outrages were occasioned by the inflammatory language of the reformed preachers from the pulpit, whose example is followed by the bigotted and intolerant preachers of the present day. These instigators to violence, clothed in the garb of ministers of peace, alarmed the passions of their hearers by inveighing against the Catholics and their church, which they stigmatized as idolatrous and tyrannical. Their turbulence occasioned the queen to forbid the preaching in public without a license, in which order she only followed the example of her two predecessors. She also issued a proclamation on the 18th of the same month, the tenor of which is thus given by Dr. Heylin:—

“The queen's highness, well remembering what great in-



convenience and dangers have grown to this her realm in times past, through the diversities of opinion in questions of religion; and hearing also that now of late, since the beginning of her most gracious reign, the same contention be again much revived, through certain false and untrue reports and rumours, spread by some evil disposed persons; hath thought good to give to understand to all her highness's most loving subjects her most gracious pleasure in manner following:—

“First, her majesty being presently, by the only goodness of God, settled in her just possession of the imperial crown of this realm, and other dominions thereunto belonging, cannot now hide that religion which God and the world knoweth she hath ever professed from her infancy hitherto. Which, as her majesty is minded to observe and maintain for herself by God's grace during her time, so doth her highness much desire, and would be glad the same were of all her subjects quietly and charitably entertained.

“And yet she doth signify unto all her majesty's loving subjects, that of her most gracious disposition and clemency, her highness mindeth not to compel any of her said subjects thereunto, until such time as further order by common assent may be taken therein. Forbidding, nevertheless, all her subjects of all degrees, at their perils, to move seditions, or stir unquietness in her people, by interpreting the laws of this realm after their brains and fancies, but quietly to continue for the time, till (as before said) further order may be taken; and therefore willeth, and straightly chargeth and commandeth, all her good and loving subjects, to live together in quiet sort, and Christian charity, leaving those new found devilish terms of Papist and heretic, and such like; and applying their whole care, study, and travel, to live in the fear of God, exercising their conversations in such charitable and godly doing, as their lives may indeed express the great hunger and thirst of God's glory, which, by rash talk and words, many have pretended: And in so doing they shall best please God, and live without danger of the laws,

and maintain the tranquillity of the realm. Whereof, as her highness shall be most glad, so if any man shall rashly presume to make any assemblies of people, or at any public assemblies, or otherwise, shall go about to stir the people to disorder or disquiet, she mindeth according to her duty, to see the same most severely reformed and punished, according to her highness's laws.

“And, furthermore, forasmuch as it is well known that sedition and false rumours have been nourished and maintained in this realm, by the subtilty and malice of some evil disposed persons, which take upon them, without sufficient authority, to preach and interpret the word of God after their own brains, in churches and other places, both public and private; and also by playing of interludes, and printing of false fond books and ballads, rhymes, and other lewd treatises in the English tongue, containing doctrine in matters now in question, and controversies touching the high points and mysteries in Christian religion; which books, ballads, rhymes, and treatises, are chiefly, by the printers and stationers, set out to sale to her grace's subjects, of an evil zeal for lucre, and covetousness of vile gain: Her highness, therefore, straightly chargeth and commandeth all and every of her said subjects, of whatever state, condition, or degree they be, that none of them presumeth from thenceforth to preach, or by way of reading in churches, or other public or private places, except in schools of the university, to interpret or preach any scriptures, or any manner of points of doctrine concerning religion. Neither also to print any book, matter, ballad, rhyme, interlude, process, or treatise, nor play any interlude, except they have her grace's special license in writing for the same, upon pain to incur her highness's indignation and displeasure.”

We have quoted this document at length, because much of our defence of this calumniated princess will hinge upon it. We defy the bitterest enemy of the Catholic religion to shew anything like “a narrowness of spirit,” or a wish “to domineer over the rights of private judgment,” or a desire to

“trample on the privileges of mankind,” in this proclamation of Mary, after the provocation she had received from the restless and seditious spirit of the reformers. We see throughout the whole of her anxiety was, that order and confidence should be restored between the different factions: that party spirit and *false* teaching should cease: that irritating language and epithets should be laid aside: that, though she openly and candidly declared her attachment to the Catholic faith, and her wish that all should think with her, yet, following the footsteps of her Saviour, she declared that she would not force the conscience of any individual, but leave the grace of God to work their conversion; but, at the same time, as the first magistrate of the realm, and the chief conservator of the peace of the kingdom, she apprized the people of her determination to punish severely those who should rashly disturb the peace and order of society, by exciting disturbances and violating the laws. Dr. Heylin admits that this proclamation commanded nothing contrary to the laws established, which might give trouble or offence to the reformed party. How unlike was the conduct of Elizabeth, her sister, who succeeded her on the throne. This lady has been extolled by bigots and hireling writers as the most illustrious and amiable of monarchs, and the most accomplished and virtuous of her sex; while her whole life was a continued scene of hypocrisy, debauchery, and cruelty. We have shewn her duplicity during the conspiracy to prevent her sister from ascending the throne; we shall now notice another instance of her deceitful conduct. As the reformed faction knew that Anne Boleyn, Elizabeth’s mother, was the prop of their party in Harry’s time, they now fixed their hopes on the daughter to oppose her sister Mary’s intention. When the council were informed of these designs, they advised Mary to put Elizabeth under a temporary arrest, but she refused her consent to the measure, and endeavoured, by persuasion and kind treatment, to win Elizabeth over to the Catholic faith, and thus frustrate the expectations of the reformers. Bess made a shew of resistance at first, but when she learned that her repugnance was

suspected not to arise from conscience, but from the intrigues of the factious, she threw herself on her knees before Mary, excused her obstinacy, and requested to be instructed in the Catholic faith, that she might see her errors, and embrace the faith of her fathers. From this time, she accompanied her sister Mary to mass, opened a chapel in her own house, and outwardly demeaned herself as a Catholic. On coming to the throne she was crowned according to the Catholic ritual, and took an oath to maintain the Catholic religion; yet no sooner was she invested with the sceptre, than she resolved to abolish that religion which she had solemnly sworn to cherish and protect. And how did she proceed to accomplish her designs? Not in the benevolent and charitable footsteps of her sister Mary, so basely and unjustly termed "bloody," who did not enact a single new law nor create a single new offence to entrap her subjects into punishment: she did not, as Mary did, issue a proclamation, exhorting "all her good and loving subjects to live together in quiet sort and Christian charity, leaving those devilish terms of Papist and heretic, and such like; and applying their whole care, study, and travel to live in the fear of God, exercising their conversation in such charitable and goodly doing:" no, no; this half-royal perjurer, this consummate hypocrite, this disgrace to her sex, who is known to few in this country but as the "*good queen Bess*," the "*virgin queen*," the "*illustrious Elizabeth*," through the gross lies of the vilest press that ever cursed and hoodwinked a nation; this hyæna in human shape, regardless of the rights of her people, secured to them by the maxims of the constitution and the stipulations of the Great Charter, resorted to the most compulsory and unconstitutional means to make the people forsake that faith which she had sworn to her sister Mary (who doubted her sincerity) she believed truly and conscientiously, and had given the same sacred pledge at her coronation to protect. Elizabeth ascended the throne on the 17th of November, 1558, and her first parliament was opened on the 25th of January following, at which the queen assisted in state by attending a solemn

high mass, after which a sermon was delivered by a reformed preacher. In this parliament a bill was passed for suppressing the monasteries which Mary had re-established, and another was introduced for annexing the spiritual supremacy to the kingly authority. This bill met with much opposition, especially in the House of Lords; but it was carried by a court majority. By this act, Hume says, the crown was vested with the whole spiritual power, to be exercised WITHOUT THE CONCURRENCE OF HER PARLIAMENT, or even of the convocation; it might repress all HERESIES, might establish or repeal all canons, might alter every point of discipline, might ordain or abolish any religious rite or ceremony; and this at the mere whim or caprice of a lascivious and perfidious woman. If Mary was unacquainted with the constitution of the country, it is clear that Elizabeth and her myrmidons were totally disregardless of its principles, by rendering her independent of parliament, and making her an absolute despot. You tell us, modern editors of the *Book of Martyrs*, that Mary was "a slave to superstition;" that "she *thought* to domineer over the rights of private judgment, and trample on the privileges of mankind;" but shew us the age or country when a pope or council usurped such an unlimited power as was here granted to an unprincipled woman, thus constituted head of the church of England! You may talk of priestcraft, of tyranny, of domineering over the rights of private judgment, and trampling on the privileges of mankind; but you cannot produce such an instance of venal dependence and base slavish submission to spiritual and temporal thralldom in the records of Catholic history, as this nation was reduced to by the corrupt parliament of the falsely called "*good queen Bess.*"

This measure being carried, it was now determined by Elizabeth and her ministers, who were certainly some of the ablest, but the most wicked and diabolical that ever directed the councils of England, to extirpate the Catholic faith out of the island, not by preaching and persuasion, but by the most sanguinary laws and proceedings that could be devised by



human beings. It was made death to exercise the inalienable privilege of mankind, freedom of conscience, by attending or celebrating mass. Fines were imposed for absence from the new-fangled church worship, which Catholics could not attend without a violation of conscience. Thus it was Elizabeth, and not Mary, that *actually*, not in thought, domineered "over the rights of private judgment," and trampled upon "the privileges of mankind." We have before said that Mary invented no new laws or offences to punish her subjects, but Elizabeth added numberless penal statutes to the code of laws existing, all of which were infringements upon the rights of conscience and the principles of the British constitution. It was not till her reign that persons were liable to punishment for what was called *constructive treason*! while it was made *high treason* to profess the same faith that was preached by the apostles of Christ, that was introduced into this island by one of their successors, the holy monk Augustin, and had continued to be professed by our forefathers for one thousand years. We will here restate our former words from the *Orthodox Journal* for Dec., 1816, taken from an article in which we proved that ELIZABETH WAS AN ODIUS PERSECUTOR OF CONSCIENCE. "In framing these merciless laws, the artful ministers had so interwoven religion and civil allegiance together, that an impeachment in either kind was equally serviceable to their purpose. The consequence was, no less than 200 persons suffered death in this reign only, many of them under circumstances of shocking barbarity, merely for exercising or embracing the Catholic faith; for their lives were offered them on condition of renouncing their religion and conforming to the established church, an evident proof that the crime for which they were executed was not for conspiring against the state, but for refusing to submit to an arbitrary and unjust control over their minds. Besides these, many Catholics were doomed to pine in loathsome prisons, others were driven out of the kingdom to avoid the like confinement; and *the rack* is acknowledged by unimpeachable

historians, to have been in constant use, to extort confession of treasons that were never thought of. It is computed that before the year 1538, which was anterior to the greatest heat of the persecutions, the number of persons who suffered death, banishment, imprisonment, or loss of estate, purely for their religion, amounted to about *twelve hundred* ! Whilst Elizabeth was thus persecuting with cold-blooded cruelty her Catholic subjects in England, she was engaged in stirring up the Belgian Calvinists to revolt against the king of Spain ; and encouraged the rebellion of Knox and his associates against the queen of Scotland, whom she looked upon as her rival for the sceptre ; and enforcing the new doctrines of the Reformation in Ireland, by military slaughter and butchery, as well as exterminating penal statutes. To enter into a detail of the horrid atrocities committed on the people of Ireland by the agents of this queen and her wicked counselors, would only disgust and tire the reader, but we cannot refrain from noticing a few facts, as they clearly demonstrate that religious persecution was not exclusively practised by Catholic governments. It is stated by the historians of that country, that thousands of the natives were swept off by the strict enforcement of the penal laws, whose only crime was the serving their Maker in the simplicity of their hearts, and presuming to exercise their own choice of the road to heaven. The heat of persecution, and the disorder occasioned by civil disturbances, prevented the obtaining a regular list of all the sufferers ; but an account has been preserved of about two hundred Irish Catholics who underwent the punishment of death during this reign, solely for the profession of their religion. Of these six were prelates, namely, Patrick O'Kelly, bishop of Mayo ; Dermot O'Hurle, archbishop of Cashel ; Richard Creagh, archbishop of Armagh, and Edmund Magauran, his successor ; Cornelius O'Duane, bishop of Down ; and Edward O'Callagher, bishop of Derry. The two first of these are reported to have suffered the most excruciating tortures previous to their execution, the former having his legs broken with hammers, and needles thrust under his

nails ; the other had his legs immersed in jack-boots filled with lime and water, until his flesh was burnt to the bone, in order to compel him to take the oath of supremacy. It was a common thing to beat with stones the shorn heads of the clergy until their brains gushed out ; and many were stretched on the rack, or pressed under weights. The year before Elizabeth's death about fifty of the monks and clergy obtained permission of her majesty to retire from Ireland to the continent, and a vessel was appointed to convey them. They embarked at Slattery, as they were ordered, but had not proceeded far on their voyage, when they were all thrown overboard and drowned. The captain and officers of the ship were confined for a time, by order of the queen, to cover her from the disgrace attendant upon such an atrocious deed, performed by her directions, and were afterwards rewarded with a grant of the lands belonging to the murdered individuals. Nor was this benignant sovereign less kind to Protestant nonconformists than to Popish recusants. By looking into Stow, Brandt, Limborch, Collier, Neale, and other Protestant historians, it will be found that in the year 1573, one Peter Burchet was examined on the score of *heresy*, by Sands, Bishop of London, but he recanted his errors. Two years afterwards, twenty-seven heretics were at one time, eleven at another, and five at a third, condemned, most of them by the same Protestant prelate, for their erroneous doctrines. Of these twenty were *whipped and banished*, others bore their fagots, and two of them, John Peterson, and Henry Tarwort, were *burnt to death* in Smithfield. In 1583, John Lewis was burnt at Norwich, for denying the divinity of our Saviour ; and Francis Kett, M.A., suffered the same kind of death at the same place, for similar opinions, in 1589. Two years afterwards, William Hackett was *hanged* for heresy, in Cheapside. Five others were also put to death in this reign, for being Brownists. Most of the executions took place in consequence of Elizabeth's issuing an ecclesiastical commission, hitherto unparalleled for its arbitrary and extensive powers. This commission consisted of forty-four mem-

bers, of whom only twelve were clergymen, and the rest laymen ; and any *three* were authorized to exercise the *whole* power of the commission. ‘Their jurisdiction,’ says Mr. Reeve, who takes his account from Hume and Neale, ‘extended over the whole kingdom, and *over all orders of men* ; their power was to visit and reform *all errors, heresies, and schisms, to regulate all opinions, and to punish every breach* of uniformity in the *public worship* ; and THEIR POWER WAS SUBJECT TO NO CONTROL. They had directions to proceed in the execution of their office, not only by the legal methods of juries and witnesses, but by any other means they should judge fit ; that is, by the rack, by tortures, and imprisonment. The punishments they inflicted were arbitrary, and directed by no rule. Their fines were so heavy as to bring total ruin upon those who had the misfortune to offend. The very suspicion of being an offender was enough to make any man such in the eyes of those inquisitors, who in that case were authorized to administer an official oath, which *compelled* the suspected person to answer *all questions*, though tending to *criminate himself* or his dearest friends. So cruel and so despotic were the powers which the supremacy was supposed in that age to confer upon the crown, and which Elizabeth exercised to their full extent.’ ”

These atrocious cruelties have been carefully concealed from the people of England by the bigotted adherents of the Reformation, as it is called, while the actions of the upright and honest Mary, whose heart was truly Catholic and English, have been blackened, vilified, and misrepresented. But the day is come when the veil of hypocrisy and falsehood shall be removed from the eyes of a blinded and misguided people, and they will then see the Truth in all her glorious attributes, and Mary’s character will appear more brilliant than it has hitherto been disfigured. Let it always be borne in mind, that Mary did not begin to exercise coercive measures until the peace of her kingdom was broken by insurrection, and her life was menaced by the enthusiastic reformers. That she did not require them to embrace a faith of her own coining

but to return to that faith which had been the creed of the whole kingdom for one thousand years before, and was then the creed of the most illustrious and virtuous monarchs, statesmen, generals, and divines, in Christendom. Elizabeth, on the other hand, persecuted the professors of the old faith because they would not consent to relinquish doctrines which they knew were of *divine* authority, for opinions merely human and liable to change. She began her persecutions without any provocation on their part, for while she was harassing the Catholics with tortures and confiscations, they were not only submissive to the laws of the state, but they actually took up arms in her defence, when the kingdom was threatened with invasion by a Catholic sovereign, the husband of Mary, and such as had property left were prodigal in their offers to equip men and fit out vessels for the defence of her throne and their country's independence. Such base ingratitude—such remorseless injustice—such unparalleled cruelty—was the base and tiger-hearted Elizabeth guilty of towards her loyal Catholic subjects; yet is she styled the “*good queen Bess*,” while her truly virtuous sister Mary, whose private life was unspotted and blameless, and who had to deal with a people heated by fanatical opinions, and urged to insubordination by the most perfidious demagogues, is represented as the “*bloody queen Mary*,” and her reign as one continued scene of persecutions, though two years had elapsed from her coming to the throne before any one suffered on the score of religion. “Compare,” we say, to repeat our own words in the *Orthodox Journal* for November, 1818, “this conduct of the *virgin* queen with the declaration of her *bloody* sister, before quoted, in which the latter assures her subjects, that, although she could not dissemble, nor hide that religion which she had always professed, she did not intend to compel any of her subjects thereunto, but leave it to their own common consent; exhorting them, at the same time, to lay aside all uncharitable terms towards each other, such as *Papist* and *heretic*, carrying themselves peaceably, and in Christian charity with all. The *good Bess*, however, possessed



no such merciful and laudable feeling. *She could dissemble* her religion in the reign of her sister, and conspire with others to dethrone her. She could submit to be crowned according to the Popish custom; could *swear* to protect the church in all her rights and privileges, and almost instantly violate the obligation of her oath. She could cause laws to be passed which intrenched upon the liberty of conscience, by making it *high treason* to exercise the right of it; she could hang, embowel alive, and quarter, innocent victims for *constructive* treason; she could encourage rebellion in states at perfect peace with her, under pretence of extending the light of *evangelical liberty*, but which was nothing less than irreligious intolerance and lawless despotism; witness the sanguinary massacres of the Catholics by the Huguenots of France, the pillaging and burning of churches, and civil wars in that country and in Germany and Flanders; the rebellions, murders, and sacrileges committed in Scotland, by Knox and his bloody associates; all which were connived at and aided by Elizabeth, and her ministers. Mary, on the contrary, as we have seen above, incited her people to charity; she repealed obnoxious laws, and contented herself with governing under those of her predecessors; she attempted not to force the consciences of the ignorant and deluded, nor would the blood of her subjects have been spilt, had they not proved ungrateful and rebellious to her mild and equitable admonitions. Were the Puritan revilers of Popery to conduct themselves against the present government of this country as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and other rebels, behaved themselves towards their lawful sovereign, Mary, they would certainly and justly experience a fate similar to that which some of their brethren met under the idol of their adoration, Elizabeth, for daring to profess a faith contrary to her commands. Yet such is the perversion of our Puritan bigots, that this sweet lady, who is described by Protestant historians as revengeful, cruel, and vindictive in her disposition, is esteemed by them the *patroness* and *protectress* of *liberty of conscience* against *Popery* and *slavery*; whilst, on the other

hand, her sister Mary, who is described, by the same historians, to have possessed a merciful disposition, is condemned as a *bloody tyrant*, because she found it necessary to consign some turbulent subjects to the offended laws of the country !”

But we must return to the reign of Mary, and produce evidence to illustrate the cause which led to the execution of so many unhappy beings in the latter part of her sway, whilst she was influenced by every desire to augment the honour, the glory, and the happiness of her kingdom. The pope, on hearing of the accession of Mary, and forejudging the result, appointed cardinal Pole, an Englishman of royal descent, as legate to the queen, but the cardinal hesitated to accept the appointment until he had more satisfactory information as to the disposition of the people of England. It was evident that the queen wished the nation to be reconciled to the holy see, and the people to return to the faith of their forefathers. In this disposition the queen met her first parliament on the 10th of October, when both peers and commoners, according to ancient usage, accompanied their sovereign to a solemn mass of the Holy Ghost. This religious ceremony is still followed in Catholic countries, both monarchical and republican, on the meeting of legislative bodies. Gardiner, the lord chancellor, made a speech to the two houses, and the speaker, in his address to the throne, enlarged on the piety, the clemency, and other virtues of Mary, whose ears were greeted with the loudest demonstrations of loyalty and attachment. A bill was introduced of a comprehensive nature, intending to repeal, at once, all the acts that had been passed in the two last reigns, affecting either the marriage of the queen's mother, or the exercise of religion as it stood in the first year of the reign of her father. By the lords, this bill met with no opposition, but it was objected to in the commons rather strongly ; however, with some modifications, and a little manœuvring on the part of the ministry, the bill was divided into two, and finally carried. The opposition to the measure for restoring the ancient form of worship was confined to the commons, and though the members in favour of the new doctrines

appeared to be one-third of the house, yet after a debate of two days' continuance, it was carried without a division. Thus fell, by a vote in parliament, that fabric raised by the hands of wicked and intriguing men, of whom Tom Cranmer was the head, though they had the blasphemy to assert that it arose by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The bill for confirming the marriage between Henry and Catherine stated, writes Dr. Lingard, "that, after the queen's father and mother had lived together in lawful matrimony for the space of twenty years, unfounded scruples and projects of divorce had been suggested to the king by interested individuals, who, to accomplish their design, procured in their favour the seals of foreign universities by bribery, of the national universities by intrigues and threats; and that Thomas, then newly made archbishop of Canterbury, most ungodlily, and against all rules of equity and conscience, took upon himself to pronounce, in the absence of the queen, a judgment of divorce, which was afterwards, on two occasions, confirmed by parliament; but that, as the said marriage was not prohibited by the law of God, it could not be dissolved by any such authority: wherefore it enacted, that all statutes, confirmatory of the divorce, should be repealed, and the marriage between Henry and Catherine should be adjudged to stand with God's law, and should be reputed of good effect and validity, to all intents and purposes whatsoever. Against this bill, though it was equivalent to a statute of bastardy in respect of Elizabeth, not a voice was raised in either house of parliament."

The other bills passed by this parliament were indicative of the constitutional disposition of Mary and her regard for the welfare of the people. All contracts entered into by individuals during the usurpation of lady Jane were legalized; all treasons created since the reign of Edward III., with the new felonies and cases of *præmunire*, introduced by Henry VIII., were abolished; at the same time, the act of Edward VI., against riotous assemblies, was *in part* revived, and extended to such meetings as should have for their object to

change, BY FORCE, the existing laws in matters of religion. To this last act the modern editors and No-Popery men cannot object, as there are laws now existing of the *same* tendency, to preserve the church of England, *by law* established, from any attempts that may be contemplated of a similar strong nature. Bills restoring in blood those persons who had been iniquitously deprived of their hereditary rights were likewise passed; and one for attaining the chief authors and abettors of the late conspiracy to exclude Mary from the throne; but its operation was limited to Tom Cranmer, lady Jane Dudley, her husband, Guilford Dudley, and his brother Ambrose, who had, it must be observed, been before arraigned and convicted *on their own confessions*. Mary had no intention, however, that they should suffer; what she hoped was, that while she kept the sentence suspended over their heads she should secure the loyalty of their friends, and accordingly she gave orders that they should be treated with as much indulgence as their situation would allow.

The next object to which Mary turned her attention was that of a marriage, by which a successor in a direct line might be secured to the realm. During her brother's life, Mary voluntarily preferred a single life, and the breath of calumny has not dared to stain her continency; but she was no sooner seated on the throne, than she avowed her intention to marry. The selection of her choice lay between the cardinal, Pole, and Courtney, the son of the countess of Exeter, who had been the individual companion of the queen. The latter she had recently released from the Tower, where he had been unjustly imprisoned from his youth: both were descended from the house of York. The other competitor was the prince of Spain, son of the emperor Charles V. Courtney, by his giddy and intemperate conduct, soon lost the affections of Mary; the cardinal, besides being an ecclesiastic, and therefore requiring a dispensation from the vows of celibacy, was deemed too old; the choice therefore fell on Philip. There were also many political motives which induced Mary to select the latter, which the French minister as strenuously en-

deavoured, but ineffectually, to counteract. The queen wisely judged that a union with a foreign prince would add to the security of her people, and it was manifest by the negociations that her happiness was centred in the happiness of her people and the honour of her country. In this resolution Mary experienced much opposition; the commons addressed her, requesting her to marry, but not to select her husband from a foreign family, but from some of the native nobility. The queen, however, was not to be moved, and secretly vowed to be the wife of Philip. And now may be said to commence the troubles that continued during the rest of the reign of this noble-minded but unfortunate sovereign. The reformers were well aware that should Mary unite herself to Philip, who was a stanch Catholic prince, there was no chance of their new doctrines; they therefore began that system of sedition, cabal, insurrection, and treason, which marked their steps wherever the executive authority was opposed to their views. Courtney, who owed so much to the queen, who had made him earl of Devonshire, was instigated to rebel against her, and prefer his suit to her sister Elizabeth. The latter was also worked upon, and while she became an object of suspicion to the friends of the Spanish match, she was the idol of those who opposed it. The greatest pains were taken to create dissension between two sisters, and awaken jealousy on the part of the queen, but Mary would not listen to their representations, at least she shewed as much by her carriage towards Elizabeth; for though she kept her near her person till the dissolution of parliament, she treated her with the greatest kindness, and when she let her depart to one of her country seats, she made her a present of two sets of valuable pearls.

Gardiner, the lord chancellor and bishop of Winchester, had opposed the Spanish match and supported the claim of Courtney; but finding that Mary was resolute in rejecting the latter, whose conduct had been childish and disgusting, he consented to negociate the treaty of marriage between the queen and Philip on such terms as would secure the rights



and liberties, and of course the honour of the nation. Gardiner, it will be observed, was a Catholic bishop, and by his civil situation of lord chancellor, the keeper of the queen's conscience, according to the notions of Protestant statesmen now-a-days. Well, this English Catholic prelate had to negotiate with the ambassadors from the Catholic emperor of Germany, in favour of an English Catholic queen, who had given them all a spice of her own determination. When the four ambassadors were admitted to an audience in presence of the whole court, they made an offer to Mary of the prince of Spain for her husband. She replied, says Dr. Lingard, "that it became not a female to speak in public on so delicate a subject as her own marriage: they were at liberty to confer with her ministers, who would make known her intentions: but this she would have them bear in mind (fixing at the same time her eyes on the ring on her finger) *that her realm was her first husband, and that no consideration should induce her to violate that faith which she had pledged at the time of her coronation.*" Do these noble sentiments of Mary exhibit a "narrowness of spirit," or an ignorance of the constitution of the country, or a desire to "trample on the privileges of mankind?" Oh! much abused and calumniated princess! how well would it have been for this country, and for Christendom in general, if thy successor had imbibed the same patriotic and disinterested feelings, the same real love of the people, and the same adherence to the fundamental principles of the constitution, which thou manifested throughout the whole of thy reign!

The terms of the treaty were soon settled between the lord chancellor and the resident ambassador from the imperial court, and the conditions agreed to were the following, according to the testimony of Dr. Heylin. "1. That it should be lawful for Philip to assume the title of all the kingdoms and provinces belonging to his wife, and should be joint governor with her over those kingdoms; the privileges and customs thereof always preserved inviolate, and the full and free distribution of bishoprics, benefices, favours, and offices,

always remaining entire in the queen. 2. That the queen should also carry the titles of all those realms, into which Philip either then was, or should be afterwards invested. 3. That if the queen survived Philip, sixty thousand pounds per annum should be assigned to her for her jointure, as had been formerly assigned to the lady Margaret, sister to king Edward IV., and wife to Charles, duke of Burgundy. 4. That the issue begotten by this marriage should succeed in all the queen's dominions, as also in the dukedom and county of Burgundy, and all those provinces in the Netherlands, of which the emperor was possessed. 5. That if none but daughters should proceed from this marriage, the eldest should succeed in all the said provinces of the Netherlands, provided that by the counsel and consent of Charles (the son of Philip, by Mary of Portugal, his first wife) she should make choice of a husband out of England or the Netherlands, or otherwise to be deprived of her right in the succession in the said estates, and Charles to be invested in them; and in that case convenient portions to be made for her and the rest of the daughters. 9. And finally, that if the said Charles should depart this life without lawful issue, that then the heir surviving of this marriage, though female only, should succeed in all the kingdoms of Spain, together with all the dominions and estates of Italy thereunto belonging."

These conditions must appear to every unprejudiced mind to be by far more advantageous to the realm of England than to the crown of Spain. In fact, every advantage was on the side of this country. Had there been issue between the parties, the territories of England would have been considerably extended, and, as it was, she obtained the most powerful alliances by the match. But Philip was a Catholic, and it was not in the nature of the disciples of the new doctrines, as we shall soon shew, to be satisfied with the *political* advantages of the country, when their *fanatical* notions on *religion* were likely to be superseded by a return to sound sense and an unerring rule of faith. Gardiner explained the articles to the lord mayor and aldermen, in an eloquent discourse, in

which he pointed out the many valuable benefits to be anticipated from such a union with the heir apparent—for Philip was only prince of Spain at the time of the treaty—to so many rich and powerful territories. The public announcement of the match, however, was far from satisfying the opponents of the measure, whose restless and unprincipled disposition began to display itself by the practice of the most abominable artifices. They circulated the most incredible stories; the private character of Philip was loaded with the basest imputations that could disgrace the lowest of mankind, much more a prince; it was given out at one time that an army of Spaniards and imperialists was coming to take absolute possession of the kingdom: at another, that Edward was still alive; that the queen had broken her promise to the Suffolk men not to alter the religion settled in Edward's time; that the marriage would be but an introduction to a second vassalage to the popes of Rome; and that Mary had therefore forfeited her right to the crown. By these and such like reports, the leading conspirators against the queen and the realm had prepared the ignorant and fanatical people for rebellion, and it was agreed that the duke of Suffolk, who still had the ambition of seeing his daughter replaced on the throne, should arm his tenants in Warwickshire; that Courtney should raise the discontented in Devonshire, under the assurance of marrying the lady Elizabeth; and Sir Thomas Wyatt was to put himself at the head of the malecontents in Kent. The conduct of the duke of Suffolk in this business was most base and ungrateful. Though implicated with Northumberland in the first conspiracy against Mary's claim, instead of suffering with him, he was allowed to retire to his own house, after a detention of three days in the Tower; his duchess was received at court with a distinction which excited the jealousy of Elizabeth; the forfeiture of his property and honours had been preserved to him by the clemency of Mary; and he had given to her the most solemn assurances of his approbation of her marriage. Such was the vile ungenerous conduct of this precisian in religion,

this disciple of Puritanism and treason. The lady Elizabeth, too, was not an unconcerned observer of this conspiracy. A letter to her from Wyat, recommending her removal from the vicinity of the metropolis to Dunnington castle, was intercepted by the council, and Mary sent an order for her to return to court; but she neither followed the advice of the conspirators nor the order of the queen; feigning indisposition, she removed to Ashridge, where she shut herself up in her chamber, ordered her servants to fortify the house, and called upon her friends to arm in her defence. This statement is made by Dr. Lingard on the authority of Noailles, the French ambassador to the court of Mary, who took too great a part in the conspiracy, in the hope of frustrating the projected marriage, which could but be injurious to his master, the king of France.

Suffolk, on his way to his estates, called upon the inhabitants of the towns through which he passed to arm in defence of their liberties, which, he said, had been betrayed by the match to the Spaniards. He found, however, that the people did not think with him, and that his cause was hopeless; he abandoned it, therefore, and trusted himself to one of his tenants, who betrayed him, and in less than a fortnight from the commencement of his treasonable crusade he found himself prisoner in the Tower. Courtney, through timidity and cowardice, seceded from the conspiracy; while Wyat, with a courage and address that gained him the applause of his enemies, drew the sword, and soon found himself at the head of fifteen hundred armed men, while others were ready to join his standard on notice being given. He was joined by 500 Londoners, sent to oppose him, and began his march towards London. Wyat's force was now about fifteen thousand men, while the ministers were in a dreadful state of alarm and distrust. Mary alone appeared firm and undaunted. She ordered her ministers to provide means of defence, and undertook herself to fix the wavering loyalty of the citizens. She desired the lord mayor to call an extraordinary meeting of the livery, and at three o'clock in the

afternoon of February the 2nd, 1534, Mary, with the sceptre in her hand, accompanied by her ladies and officers of state, entered the Guildhall. She was received with becoming respect, and in a firm and dignified tone she complained of the disloyalty of the men of Kent, and expressed her conviction that her people, especially her good city of London, loved her too well to surrender her into the hands of rebels. "As for this marriage," she said, "ye shall understand that I enterprized not the doing thereof, without the advice of all our privy council; nor am I, I assure ye, so bent to my own will, or so affectionate, that for my own pleasure I would choose where I lust, or needs must have a husband. I have hitherto lived a maid, and doubt not but, with God's grace, I am able to live so still. Certainly, did I think that this marriage were to the hurt of you, my subjects, or to the impeachment of my royal estate, I would never consent thereunto. And I promise you, on the word of a queen, that if it shall not appear to the lords and commons in parliament to be for the benefit of the whole realm, I will never marry while I live. Wherefore stand fast against these rebels, your enemies and mine; fear them not, for, I assure ye, I fear them nothing at all; and I will leave with you my lord Howard, and my lord admiral, who will be assistant with the mayor for your defence." With these words she took her departure, and we need not add—for base must have been the hearts of those who could not feel for such a sovereign—that the hall shook with acclamations of loyalty and transport. By the next morning more than twenty thousand men had enrolled themselves for the protection of the city. We must here add, that Fox allows that the queen spoke with so much ease in delivering this speech, that "she seemed to have perfectly conned it with book."

On that day Wyatt entered Southwark, but his followers had begun to forsake him, and his numbers were dwindled down to seven thousand men, who were hourly deserting. Upon his coming into Southwark, Stow says: "He made proclamation that no soldier should take anything, but that



he should pay for it; and that his coming was to resist the Spanish king. Notwithstanding, forthwith divers of his company, being gentlemen (as they said), went to Winchester-place, made havock of the bishop's goods (he being lord-chancellor), not only of his victuals, whereof there was plenty, but whatsoever else, not leaving so much as one lock of a door, but the same was taken off and carried away, nor a book in his gallery uncut, or rent into pieces, so that men might have gone up to the knees in leaves of books cut out and thrown under feet." Such were the Vandalic proceedings of these defenders of the new light and learning. Catholics are reproached for their presumed ignorance and distaste of letters and the sciences, while they have the mortification to know that many of the choicest volumes of the classics, history, and the arts—the toil of the calumniated and abused monks, before the art of printing was discovered—were laid waste and destroyed by the ruthless hands of their savage and unlettered accusers. After loitering two days in Southwark, "to no purpose at all," writes Dr. Heylin, "more than the sacking of Winchester-house, and the defacing of the bishop's library there, unless it were to leave a document to posterity that God infatuates the counsels of those wretched men who take up arms against their princes," Wyatt marched to Kingston, and thence to Brentford, towards London, and soon after made his appearance at Hydepark corner. Mary then occupied the palace of St. James. The court was in the utmost consternation; the ministers, on their knees, implored the queen to seek her safety by retiring to the Tower. Mary, however, scorned the pusillanimity of her advisers, and announced her fixed determination to continue at her post. A council of war was held, and it was determined to place a strong force at Ludgate, and allow Wyatt to advance to this post. In the mean time, Wyatt, who seemed to be under a spirit of infatuation, wasted his time in the repair of a carriage of one of his pieces, which had been dismounted by the breaking down of a wheel. This delay prevented him from keeping his appointment with his

associates at Ludgate, which caused the chief of his advisers to abandon him in despair. Among these was Poynet, the Protestant bishop of Winchester, who fled with all speed to the continent. Another of them, sir George Harper, rode to St. James's and announced the approach of Wyatt. At four in the morning of the 7th February, 1554, the drum beat to arms, and in a few hours the royalists were in motion. Wyatt reached Hyde-park corner at nine, and though he found himself deserted by many of his followers, he resolved to make a desperate effort, and rushed forward to charge a body of cavalry, posted to intercept his progress. They opened and allowed a body of three or four hundred to pass, and while they engaged the rear of the rebels, Wyatt, regardless of the battle that raged behind him, passed hastily through Piccadilly, and, without noticing the palace of St. James, hurried on through the Strand to Ludgate, where he found himself hemmed in on both sides, and constrained to yield himself prisoner, after making a stout resistance with forty of his followers. Wyatt was taken first to St. James's, and then conveyed to the Tower, where he was rejoined by the chief of the surviving conspirators.

Burnet says: "The Popish authors studied to cast the blame of this on the reformed preachers; but did not name any one of them that was in it; so it appears that what some later writers have said of Poynet's having been in it is false; otherwise his name had certainly been put in the number of those that were attainted for it." This attempt of the bishop of Sarum to screen the reformed preachers from *rebellious practices* is congenial to his character. Sir John Dalrymple, in his *Memoirs*, says: "I have never tried Burnet's facts by the test of dates and original papers without finding them wrong." Who the Popish authors were Burnet does not say; we, however, can produce Protestant authorities to substantiate the fact that some of the reformed preachers *did* take an active part in this conspiracy. Dr. Heylin says: "It cannot be denied but that the restitution of the reformed religion was the matter principally aimed at in this rebellion,

though nothing but the match with Spain appeared in the outside of it. Which appears plainly by a book writ by Christopher Goodman (associated with John Knox, for setting up presbytery and rebellion in the kirk of Scotland), in which he takes upon him to shew *how far superior magistrates ought to be obeyed*. For having filled almost every chapter of it with railing speeches against the queen, and stirred up the people to rebel against her, he falleth amongst the rest upon this expression, viz.: ‘Wyatt did but his duty, and it was but the duty of all others that profess the gospel, to have risen with him for maintenance of the same. His cause was just, and they were all traitors that took no part with him. O noble Wyatt, thou art now with God, and those worthy men that died in that happy enterprise.’ But this book was written at Geneva, where Calvin reigned; to whom no pamphlet could be more agreeable, than such as did reproach this queen; whom, in his *Comment upon Amos*, he entitleth by the name of Proserpine, and saith, that she exceeded in her cruelties all the devils in hell. Much more it is to be admired, that Dr. John Poynt, the late bishop of Winchester, should be of counsel in the plot, or put himself into their camp, and attend them unto the place where the carriage brake. Where, when he could not work on Wyatt to desist from that unprofitable labour in remounting the cannon, he counselled Vanham, Bret, and others, to shift for themselves, took leave of his more secret friends, told them that he would pray for their good success, and so departed and took ship for Germany, where he after died.”

Thus, then, it stands confessed by a Protestant historian, that the reformers sought to re-establish their religion by the power of the sword, and not by the force of reason, while the queen herself had, during this period, abstained from any harsh or severe measures towards her enemies. When the former conspiracy was subdued, she would not allow more than *three* persons to be put to death, an instance of lenity unparalleled in the history of any age, and a damning refutation of the base statement made by the modern editors of

Fox, that "the first exertion of her regal power was to *wreak vengeance* upon ALL those who had supported the title of lady Jane Grey." Mary was proclaimed in July, 1553, consequently seven months of her reign had passed over since the first attempt to deprive her of the crown, and only three traitors had suffered for it. Others who had incurred the guilt of treason in that plot had been sentenced to death, but were respited through the clemency of Mary. Of these were Tom Cranmer, lady Jane Grey, and her husband, the lord Dudley. While Mary is represented by the modern editors of this *Book of Martyrs* as trampling on the privileges of mankind, other and more correct historians state, that she was reproved by the emperor and some of her own counsellors for her too great love of mercy. They argued, that impunity would encourage the factious to a repetition of their treasonable practices, and that if they chose to brave the authority of their sovereign and the laws, it ought to be at the peril of their lives. The queen herself began to feel the truth of the maxims; she considered her former lenity as the cause of the insurrection just suppressed, from which she had narrowly escaped with her life, and in the moment of irritation, and while she was agitated with her late escape from danger, she was induced to sign a warrant for the execution of Guilford Dudley and his wife at the expiration of three days. Much opprobrium has been cast by Protestant writers on this order for executing so young an offender as the lady Jane Grey, and she is looked upon as a martyr for the Protestant religion. Had she been termed a martyr to her father's treasonable ambition, the truth would not have been outraged; for had the duke of Suffolk remained faithful to his promise, after having been pardoned his first traitorous designs towards his good but maligned queen, his daughter might have followed her religion and died a natural death, as well as her husband, so little inclined was Mary to shed their blood. But the guilt of the duke, her father, brought on the punishment of his daughter, the lady Jane, which his ambition had first caused her to incur. The sentence, as we before

observed, had been put off above a half-a-year, and it was not until the duke of Suffolk, with his brothers, the lords Thomas and Leonard Grey, had endeavoured to raise the counties of Warwick and Leicester for the purpose of de-throning Mary herself, that she consented to the lady Jane's death, to prevent any further pretext for turbulent and fanatic spirits to rise against their lawful sovereign, and disturb the peace of the community. No part of the late conspiracy was imputed to the lady Jane, but she stood legally convicted, and was under sentence of death for assuming royalty at king Edward's death. The order for execution being intimated to her, she received it with much composure, and said she had deserved it for usurping a crown which belonged to another ; but, at the same time, she related the little share she had in that transaction, and the constraint put upon her by her family ; that it was no easy matter for a person so young as she was to withstand the authority of a father and a husband, and of so many of the nobility ; and it would be her peculiar fate to be justly condemned, and yet die innocent. On the 12th of February, after her husband had been beheaded on Tower hill, she was led out to a scaffold which had been erected on the green within the Tower, where, after a few words to the spectators, she laid her head on the block, and it was severed from her body at one stroke of the executioner. We agree with Dr. Lingard, that " it would perhaps have been to the honour of Mary if she had overlooked the provocation, and refused to visit on the daughter the guilt of the father. Her youth ought to have pleaded most powerfully in her favour ; and, if it were feared that she would again be set up by the factious as a competitor with her sovereign, the danger might certainly have been removed by some expedient less cruel than the infliction of death." Still, we must observe that Mary could not act without her counsellors, and probably could they have foretold the handle that would have been made of their decision, to blacken and defame the religion of Christ, they would have decided differently. One thing is certain, namely, that the death of this lady did not proceed



from religious bigotry and intolerance on the part of Mary and her advisers, as the people of England have been so long led to believe by the intolerant haters of Popery. Even Burnet admits that it was rather a reason of state than private resentment that instigated the queen to consent to the execution.

The trial of the Duke of Suffolk soon followed the execution of his daughter. He was found guilty, condemned and executed. Burnet says: "He was the less pitied, because by his means his daughter was brought to her untimely end." Dr. Lingard likewise observes, "that his ingratitude to the queen, his disregard for his daughter's safety, and his meanness in seeking to purchase forgiveness by the accusation of others, had sharpened public indignation against him." He was followed by his brother, the lord Thomas Grey. Wm. Thomas, Esq. stabbed himself in prison, but died on the scaffold. To these three followed Sir Thomas Wyatt, whose weak and wavering conduct in prison brought discredit upon him. Croft, another of the principal conspirators, obtained his pardon, and Sir Nicholas Throgmorton pleaded his own cause with such success, that he obtained a verdict in his favour from the jury. About fifty of the common men were hanged in the different parts of the metropolis: half-a-dozen suffered in Kent, and four hundred of the remainder were marched up to the palace with halters round their necks, where Mary appeared at the balcony, pronounced their pardon herself, and desired them to go home in peace. "These executions," writes Dr. Lingard, "have induced some writers to charge Mary with unnecessary cruelty; perhaps those who compare her with her contemporaries in similar circumstances will hesitate to subscribe to that opinion. If, on this occasion, sixty of the insurgents were sacrificed to her justice or resentment, we shall find in the history of the next reign that, after a rebellion of a less formidable aspect, some hundreds of victims were required to appease the offended majesty of Elizabeth." This learned historian, in a note, further remarks: "If we look at the conduct of the government after

the rebellions of 1715 and 1745, we shall not find that the praise of superior lenity is due to more modern times ;" or, he might have added, to Protestant rulers.

We have previously noticed that the princess Elizabeth was not an unconcerned spectator in this conspiracy against her queen and sister, any more than Courtney, the earl of Devonshire. The latter was committed to the Tower, and three members of the council were ordered to repair to Ashbridge to conduct Elizabeth to court. The modern editors, we see, have devoted nearly seventeen pages of their work to relate the "miraculous preservation of the lady Elizabeth from extreme calamity and danger in the time of queen Mary, her sister," as detailed, we believe, by John Fox himself, and worthy it is of that celebrated inventor of lies. It is not to be expected that we can enter into a complete refutation of this farrago of cant and fiction ; suffice it to say, that the extreme calamity and danger of lady Elizabeth lay in her being a suspected traitoress, and being ill, or pretending to be ill at the time these messengers were sent to bring her up to town. She received them in bed, complaining of severe illness ; but two physicians attesting that she was able to travel, she was reluctantly obliged to accompany her trusty guides to London by short stages, not however, as a prisoner, but in state, in a litter, attended by two hundred gentlemen. What dreadful calamity and danger this lady traitor must have been in from her sister, queen Mary ! She appeared unwell, and it was reported that she had been poisoned ; but a week restored her to health, and she demanded an audience of her sister. Mary returned for answer, that she must first establish her innocence. The council was in possession of a considerable mass of presumptive evidence against Elizabeth ; the duke of Suffolk and Wyatt declared against her and Courtney, and though both declared their innocence, a warrant was made out for the committal of Elizabeth, who received the intelligence with terror, and stamped and swore with fury. She was however compelled to submit, and took possession of her cell, under the fear that she would soon

share the fate of her mother. From this state of "extreme calamity and danger" she was saved by the man who is represented by the unprincipled bigots of the day as thirsting for her blood. Gardiner, while he acknowledged that Elizabeth and Courtney had been privy to the designs of the rebels, and deserved punishment for their treason, yet contended they had not implicated themselves by any overt act, and therefore could not be convicted legally. His enemies seized the opportunity to ruin Gardiner with the queen, but Mary listened to the reasoning of her chancellor, found he was correct in his exposition of the law, and the next day Elizabeth was released from the Tower. Does this shew a narrowness of spirit, or an ignorance of the constitution, which the modern editors accuse this injured queen of? Courtney was sent to Fotheringay castle, there to remain in custody.

Wyatt's rebellion occasioned a delay of the intended marriage between Mary and Philip for a few weeks, but the restless spirit of the fanatical reformers was still active in shewing itself. Three days before the execution of Wyatt, namely, on the 8th of April, "being then Sunday," says Stow, "a cat, with her head shorn, and the likeness of a vestment cast over her, with her fore feet tied together, and a round piece of paper like a singing cake betwixt them, was hanged on a gallows in Cheap, near to the cross in the parish of St. Matthew, which cat being taken down, was carried to the bishop of London, and he caused the same to be shewed at Paul's Cross by the preacher, Dr. Pendleton." On the 10th of June following, the same historian says: "Dr. Pendleton preached at Paul's Cross, at whom a gun was shot, the pellet whereof went very near him, and lit on the church wall. But the shooter could not be found." This daring attempt at assassination by the evangelical religionists was followed by a proclamation, forbidding the shooting of hand-guns and the bearing of weapons. These outrageous proceedings arose not only from the intended marriage with the prince, but likewise from the desire the queen had always

expressed that the people should return to the ancient faith and join the bosom of the universal church, under which their ancestors had enjoyed so much glory and happiness. In order to prepare the way for this wished-for event, the queen, about the 15th of March, in this year, issued out a commission, by which all the MARRIED clergy were deprived of their benefices, being unqualified to possess them. This inability was founded on the *constant practice* of the western church, on the *unanimous authority of the canons*, and the *solemn engagement* made by every ecclesiastic at his ordination: likewise on the 4th of Henry VIII.'s six articles, which the parliament had passed into a law, and a late statute of Mary's parliament, which recalled all religious matters to their condition at that prince's death, had ratified. So that Mary, instead of being "*unacquainted with the constitution of the country*," as the modern editors shamelessly assert, did nothing but in the most constitutional manner; for this injunction was as legal and parliamentary as it was just and canonical. In consequence of these orders, Holgate, archbishop of York, and the bishops of St. David's, Chester, and Bristol, who had been regulars, and, besides the promise made at their ordination, had broken the solemn vows made on entering a religious state, and those of Gloucester and Hereford, who were of the secular clergy, were deprived. Scory and Barlow, bishops of Chichester and Bath, who were in the same predicament, fled the kingdom. As much calumny and misrepresentation have been resorted to by the advocates of Protestantism and the enemies of Catholicism to extol the character of the early reformers, so called, and brand the opposers of religious innovations and defenders of truth and unity with cruelty and love of blood, we deem it our duty to give the reader some account of the chief of these deposed bishops, from the testimony, observe, of PROTESTANT historians.

Holgate, archbishop of York, not only made use of the indulgent doctrine, which, in Edward's reign, allowed the clergy to marry, but extended the licence to take another man's wife.—*Collier's Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii. b. 5. p. 349.

Robert Farrar was, first, chaplain to Cranmer, and then, by the protector Seymour's favour, promoted to the bishopric of St. David; but, on that nobleman's fall, fifty-six articles were exhibited against him, for which he was confined during the remainder of Edward's reign, and now degraded.—*Ath. Oxon.* p. 679.

John Bird, bishop of Chester, was a Carmelite friar, and for his obsequiousness to the court measures at the dissolution of the monasteries, and a remarkable sermon in support of the lay supremacy, was promoted to a see in Ireland; from whence he was translated to Bangor, and in 1514 to Chester. He went all the lengths of Henry's and Edward's reigns, and made use of the indulgence, which the latter allowed, of taking a wife. Being deprived of his bishopric, he lived privately at Chester till his death, in 1556.—*Bale*, cent. ii. No. 41.—*Pitts, de Illust.*—*Ang. Script.*—*Godwin, de Præsul. Ang.*

Paul Bush, bishop of Bristol, was an Augustine friar, and had been chaplain to Henry VIII., who promoted him to that see for his compliance with the court measures. But though he betrayed the same passive disposition during Edward's reign, and took a wife, he was never known either to preach or write against the ancient religion. He readily gave up his bishopric at the queen's command, and parted from his wife, and lived privately in Bristol till his death, in 1558.—*Godwin de Præsul. Ang.*—*Ath. Oxon.*

William Barlow, bishop of Bath and Wells, was a Canon Regular, and very active, both in promoting the dissolution of religious houses in Henry's reign, and forwarding the various innovations of Edward's. Being deprived of his bishopric on account of marriage, he fled to Germany.—*Godwin, de Præsul. Ang.*—*Ath. Oxon.* vol. i. p. 156.

Such were some of the chief performers in the work of doctrinal novelty and ministerial rapacity; with what discernment their places were supplied, so far as firmness and interest of principle were concerned, the event verified. On the queen's death, when her successor, after swearing to pro-



teet the Catholic religion, thought proper to restore the new form of public worship, only Kitchin, bishop of Llandaff, who, Proteus like, had put on all the forms of religion in the three last reigns, could be induced, of that venerable bench, to submit to the change. Neither loss of wealth and dignity, nor the hardships of imprisonment or deportation, shook their constancy to the true faith; and Dr. Heath, archbishop of York, and lord-chancellor, having succeeded Holgate in the one, and Gardiner in the other, made a discourse, at the opening of the first parliament of Elizabeth, on that lady's assuming the *spiritual* supremacy of the kingdom, which, for clearness and solidity, may vie with any of the pleadings of Tully and Demosthenes.

These proceedings alarmed the already discontented and turbulent leaders of evangelism, who, to their outrages already mentioned, and finding they were not likely to succeed by open force and rebellion, had recourse to stratagem and artifice, thinking thus to befool the people, and work them into hatred against Mary's government. This device we shall give in Dr. Heylin's words. "A young maid," writes the doctor, "called Elizabeth Crofts, about the age of eighteen years, was tutored to counterfeit certain speeches in the wall of a house not far from Aldersgate, where she was heard of many, but seen of none; and that her voice might be conceived to have somewhat in it more than ordinary, a strange whistle was devised for her, out of which her words proceeded in such a tone as seemed to have nothing mortal in it. And thereupon it was affirmed by some of the people,—great multitudes whereof resorted daily to the place,—that it was an angel, or, at least, a voice from heaven; by others, it could be nothing but the Holy Ghost; but, generally, she passed by the name of the *Spirit in the Wall*. For the interpreting of whose words there wanted not some of the confederates, who mingled themselves by turns amongst the rest of the people, and taking on them to expound what the spirit said, delivered many dangerous and seditious words against the queen, her marriage with

the prince of Spain, the mass, confession, and the like. The practice was first set on foot on the 14th of March, which was within ten days after the publishing of the articles, and for a while it went on fortunately enough, according to the purpose of the chief contrivers. But the abuse being searched into, and the plot discovered, the wench was ordered to stand upon the scaffold near St. Paul's Cross, on the 15th of July, there to abide during the time of the sermon, and that being done, to make a public declaration of that lewd imposture. Let not the Papists be from henceforth charged with Elizabeth Barton, whom they called the *Holy Maid of Kent*; since now the Zuinglian gospellers, (for I cannot but consider this a plot of theirs), have raised up their Elizabeth Crofts, whom they called the *Spirit in the Wall*, to draw aside the people from their due allegiance." Another of the inconsistencies of these pretended reformers was, the interpretation of the scriptures against the right of the queen to rule over them. Before Mary ascended the throne they had no objection to a female for their sovereign, because she happened to have been brought up in the new doctrines; but now they had a constitutional and religious queen, whose sole object was the happiness of her people—but, at the same time, was persuaded, from the experience of history, that there was no permanent foundation for that happiness but in following the precepts of the Catholic faith—they turn their backs upon their own proceedings, and pretend that as scripture declared man is the head of woman, it was contrary to the written word that a woman should possess the supreme authority over man.

Heretofore, be it observed, not an act had passed to infringe on the rights of conscience, or make new offences to come at the fanatical disturbers of the peace. The preparations for the marriage proceeded with activity, and on the 19th of July, the prince of Spain landed at Southampton, and proceeded to Winchester, where he was met by the queen, and on the 25th the nuptial ceremony was performed in the cathedral of that city, by Gardiner, the bishop of that diocese.

Philip was in the twenty-seventh year of his age, and the queen in her thirty-eighth. As soon as the ceremony was concluded, the imperial ambassador, in the name of the emperor, presented Philip with an instrument, by which he conferred upon him the kingdom of Naples. This proceeding put the royal pair upon a footing of equality, and they were proclaimed by the following style:—*Philip and Mary, by the grace of God, king and queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, and Ireland; defenders of the faith; princes of Spain and Sicily; archdukes of Austria; dukes of Milan, Burgundy, and Brabant; counts of Hapsbourg, Flanders and Tyrol.* Such were the high and honourable titles affixed to the crown of England by the marriage of Mary to Philip; but, notwithstanding, she did not give satisfaction to the malcontents, because she and her royal husband were Catholics. The immense wealth brought over by Philip, and sent to the Tower to be coined, which filled ninety-seven chests, each chest being a yard and four inches long, and required twenty carts to convey it, we might have supposed would have softened down the antipathy to Catholicism. Could England obtain such a treasure at the time we are writing (Dec. 15, 1825), when the banks in the city and country are daily smashing, we really believe the Jews on the Stock Exchange would embrace Catholicism, did the aid come from a Catholic country; however, the fanatics of old were incorrigible, and every engine was called into requisition to keep alive religious rancour. But Mary had taken her measures, and was resolved to pursue them.

On the 12th of November the second parliament of this queen met for the dispatch of business; and on the 24th of the same month cardinal Pole arrived at Westminster, as legate from the holy see, with powers to reconcile the nation to the universal church. An act, by which the cardinal was restored to blood, the attainder reversed, and he reinstated in all his rights and honours, had previously passed, and was presented to him at Gravesend on the foregoing day by the earl of Shrewsbury and the bishop of Durham. On the

morning of the 28th of November, the legate paid a visit to the king and queen, when the accomplishment of the great work of the nation's reconciliation with the Catholic church was brought about. The incidents attending this most important event are so truly interesting to Englishmen, that we shall give them in the words of Dr. Lingard, not being willing to trust our pen with the narration. "In consequence of a royal message," writes the learned historian, "the lords and commons repaired to the court: and, after a few words from the chancellor, Pole, in a long harangue, returned them thanks for the act which they had passed in his favour; exhorted them to repeal, in like manner, all the statutes enacted in derogation of the papal authority; and assured them of every facility on his part to effect the reunion of the church of England with that of Rome. The chancellor, having first taken the orders of the king and queen, replied, that the two houses would deliberate apart, and signify their determination on the following morning.

"The motion for the reunion was carried almost by acclamation. In the lords every voice was raised in its favour: in the commons, out of three hundred members, two only demurred, and these desisted from their opposition the next day. It was determined to present a petition in the name of both houses, to the king and queen, stating that they looked back with sorrow and regret on the defection of the realm from the communion of the apostolic see: that they were ready to repeal, as far as in them lay, every statute which had either caused or supported that defection: and that they hoped, through the mediation of their majesties, to be absolved from all ecclesiastical censures, and to be received into the bosom of the universal church.

"On the following day, the feast of St. Andrew, the queen took her seat on the throne. The king was placed on her left hand, the legate, but at greater distance, on her right. The chancellor read the petition to their majesties: they spoke to the cardinal: and he, after a speech of some duration, absolved all those present, and the whole nation, and the

dominions thereof, from all heresy and schism, and all judgments, censures, and penalties for that cause incurred: and restored them to the communion of the holy church, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 'Amen' resounded from every part of the hall: and the members, rising from their knees, followed the king and queen into the chapel, where a *Te Deum* was chanted in thanksgiving for the event. The next Sunday the legate, at the invitation of the citizens, made his public entry into the metropolis; and Gardiner preached at St. Paul's Cross the celebrated sermon in which he lamented in bitter terms his conduct under Henry VIII.; and exhorted all, who had fallen through his means, or in his company, to rise with him and seek the unity of the Catholic church.

“ To proceed with this work, the two houses and the convocation simultaneously presented separate petitions to the throne. That from the lords and commons requested their majesties to obtain from the legate all those dispensations and indulgences, which the innovations made during the schism had rendered necessary, and particularly such as might secure the property of the church to the present possessors without scruple of conscience, or impeachment from the ecclesiastical courts. The other, from the clergy, stated their resignation of all right to those possessions of which the church had been deprived; and their readiness to acquiesce in every arrangement to be made by the legate. His decree was soon afterwards published:—1. That all cathedral churches, hospitals, and schools, founded during the schism, should be preserved; 2. That all persons, who had contracted marriage within the prohibited degrees, without dispensation, should remain married; 3. That all judicial processes made before the ordinaries, or an appeal before delegates, should be held valid; and 4. That the possessors of church property should not, either now or hereafter, be molested, under pretence of any canons of councils, decrees of popes, or censures of the church; for which purpose, in virtue of the authority vested in him, he took from all spiritual courts and judges the



cognizance of these matters, and pronounced, beforehand, all such processes and judgments invalid and of no effect.

“ In the mean time a joint committee of lords and commons had been actively employed in framing a most important and comprehensive bill, which deserves the attention of the reader, from the accuracy with which it distinguishes between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, and the care with which it guards against any encroachment on the part of the latter. It first repeals several statutes by name, and then, in general, all clauses, sentences, and articles in every other act of parliament made since the 20th of Henry VIII., against the supreme authority of the pope's holiness, or see apostolic. It next recites the two petitions, and the dispensation of the legate ; and enacts, that every article in that dispensation shall be reputed good and effectual in law, and may be alleged and pleaded in all courts, spiritual and temporal. It then proceeds to state, that though the legate hath by his decree taken away all matter of impeachment, trouble, or danger to the holders of church property ; yet, because the title of lands and hereditaments in this realm is grounded on the laws and customs of the same, and to be tried and judged in no other courts than those of their majesties, it is therefore enacted, by authority of parliament, that all such possessors of church property shall hold the same in manner and form as they would have done, had this act never been made ; and that any person who shall molest such possessors by process out of any ecclesiastical court, either within or without the realm, shall incur the penalty of *præmunire*. Next, it provides, that all papal bulls, dispensations, and privileges, not containing matter prejudicial to the royal authority, or to the laws of the realm, may be put in execution, used, and alleged in all courts whatsoever ; and concludes by declaring, that nothing in this act shall be explained to impair any authority or prerogative belonging to the crown, in the 20th year of Henry VIII. ; that the pope shall have and enjoy, without diminution or enlargement, the same authority and jurisdiction, which he might then

have lawfully exercised; and that the jurisdiction of the bishops shall be restored to that state in which it existed at the same period. In the lords, the bill was read thrice in two days; in the commons, it was passed, after a sharp debate, on the third reading. Thus was re-established, in England, the old system of religious polity, which had prevailed for so many centuries before Henry VIII."

The same writer observes, in a note on the 20th of Henry VIII.: "Most readers have very confused and incorrect notions of the jurisdiction which the pontiff, in virtue of his supremacy, claimed to exercise within the realm. From this act, and the statutes which it repeals, it follows, that that jurisdiction was comprised under the following heads: 1. He was acknowledged as chief bishop of the Christian church, with authority to reform and redress heresies, errors, and abuses, within the same. 2. To him belonged the institution or confirmation of bishops elect. 3. He could grant to clergymen licenses of non-residence, and permission to hold more than one benefice, with cure of souls. 4. He dispensed in the canonical impediments to matrimony; and 5. He received appeals from the spiritual courts."

We cannot pass over this memorable event, without taking a slight review of some of the causes which seem to have prepared the nation for so speedy and universal a revolution; one of which seems to have been the shortness of time—not more than twenty years—since England had renounced the religion to which she had now returned, and which had been her faith for above nine centuries. Another was, probably, so far as the great body of the people was concerned, the deplorable state of misery and starvation to which the poor had been reduced by the dissolution of monasteries and religious houses, which it was hoped, no doubt, would be removed by the re-establishment of those receptacles of virtue and charity. To these facts we shall add the authority of witnesses who, in this case, being Protestant, must be above all question: one of them assigns very natural reasons for the little satisfaction which sensible and well-disposed minds

could find in such novelties; and the other sets forth, in a very impartial light, some arguments, "which," as he expresses himself, "may prevail on men of much reason, and more piety," to entertain a favourable opinion of the religion which the nation now embraced.

The first acknowledges, "that the licentious and dissolute life of many of the professors of the gospel, and—which was but too visible in some of the more eminent among them—the open blemishes of some of the clergy who promoted the Reformation, contributed to alienate the people, to raise a general aversion, and to make the nation entertain as advantageous a notion of the religion they had quitted, as their prejudices had been strong against it; and to look upon all the innovations that had been made as so many inlets into all manner of vice and wickedness."—*Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 217.

"The members of the Roman Catholic communion," says the other author, "whose authority I have pleaded, may say, that their religion was that of their forefathers, and had the actual possession of men's minds before the opposite opinions had even a name; and having continued in it through such a length of time, it would be objected to them with an ill grace, that this was the effect of invention or design; because it was not likely that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrine should serve the different ends of several ages. This prescription, moreover, rests on these grounds: that truth is more ancient than falsehood; and that God would not, for so many ages, have forsaken his church, and left her in error. To this antiquity of doctrine is annexed an uninterrupted succession of their bishops from the apostles, and particularly of their superior bishop from St. Peter, whose personal prerogatives were so great, and the advantageous manner in which many eminent prelates of other sees have expressed themselves with regard to the church of Rome. This prerogative includes the advantages of monarchy, and the constant benefits which are derived from that form of government. Nor does the multitude and

variety of people who are of that persuasion, their apparent consent with elder ages, and their agreement with one another, form a less presumption in their favour. The same conclusion [he says] must be inferred from the differences which have arisen amongst their adversaries, and from the casualties which have happened to many of them; from the oblique and sinister proceedings of some who have left their communion; from the appellation of heretic and schismatic, which they fix on all who dissent from them." To these negative arguments he adds those of a more positive kind: viz., "The beauty and splendour of the church of Rome, her solemn service, the stateliness and magnificence of her hierarchy, and the name of Catholic, which she claims as her own due, and to concern no other sect of Christianity. It has been their happiness to be instrumental to the conversion of many nations. The world is witness to the piety and austerity of their religious orders; to the single life of their priests and bishops; the severity of their fasts and observances; to the great reputation of many of their bishops for faith and sanctity, and the known holiness of some of those persons, whose institutes the religious orders follow."—*Dr. Jeremy Taylor on the Liberty of Prophesying.*

The renouncement of the supremacy of the see of Rome was the first breach of this nation with the Catholic church, and the acknowledgment of it was the first step of a return to the ancient faith. We are aware that there is much difficulty to satisfy the Protestant reader of the expediency, and much more the necessity, of such a measure; however, we will here quote the authority of a learned Protestant writer on the subject, and leave it to his own common sense to decide the point. "It is well known," says *Grotius*, speaking of himself, in his last reply to *Rivet*, written a short time before his death, "that I have always wished to see Christians reunited in the same body; and I once thought this conjunction might be begun by an union of Protestants among themselves. I have since perceived that this is impossible, not only because the Calvinists are averse to all such agreements, but because

Protestants are not associated under any one form of government, and therefore cannot be united in one body, but must necessarily be separated into other new sects and divisions. I therefore, and many others with me, plainly see that this concord of Protestants can never be effected, unless they are united to the Roman see, without which no common church government can take place: for which reason I wish that the separation which has been made, and the causes of it, may cease. Now, amongst these, the canonical primacy of the bishop of Rome cannot, as Melancthon himself confesses, be placed; for he judges that very primacy necessary, in order to maintain and preserve unity." If this testimony is not sufficient to convince the reader of the necessity of having a supreme head to preserve unity in the body, let him consult Dr. Field's preface to his *Book on the Church*; Dr. Hammond, in his *Treatise on Heresy*, § 13, Nos. 2, 3, and his *Comment. on 1 Tim. iii. 15*; Dr. Jackson on the Creed, b. 2, chap. iv. p. 165, and Dr. Ferne; who all seem to extort from their readers the same concession in this article of the Catholic faith, which St. Paul drew from Agrippa with respect to the Christian religion in general: "*Thou persuadest me almost to be a Christian.*" Acts, xxvi. 28.

The reconciliation was concluded by a general pardon for offences against the queen, and among other prisoners were, according to Stow, the late archbishop of York, Sir John Rogers, Sir James a Crofts, Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, Sir Nicholas Arnold, Sir Edward Warwick, Sir George Harper, Sir William Sentlow, Sir Andrew Dudley, and Sir Gavin Carew, knights. These prisoners were set at liberty on the 18th of January, 1555, and it clearly shews that Mary did not then seek "to domineer over the rights of private judgment, and trample on the liberties of mankind." No, no, modern editors of *Fox's Book of Martyrs*; it was not Mary that sought to play the tyrant, but the pretended martyrs of John Fox and their confederates at home and abroad, who, by their plottings and preachings, sapped the basis of social order and civil liberty, and compelled the Catholic sovereigns



of Europe to resort to harsh measures, to preserve the rights and privileges of mankind. We have seen that Poyney, bishop of Winchester, fled to the continent, after engaging in Wyatt's rebellion. Others of the reforming party betook themselves likewise to flight; some to Frankfort, and some to Geneva, where they practised their treasons underhand. Of these, were Whittingham, Goodman, Scory, Wood, Knox, JOHN FOX, Jewel, Horn, Sands, and Grindal, and they had not long been at the first mentioned place, before they began to wrangle about the Book of Common Prayer, and other matters, as well as to hatch up treason. "When Whittingham, and divers others of a more violent humour," says the author of *The Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline*, "came first to Frankfort, they fell presently into a very special liking of the Geneva discipline, as finding it to contain such rules and practices as did greatly concur with their own dispositions, viz: that if bishops and princes refused to admit of the gospel, they might be used by their subjects as the bishop of Geneva was used, that is, DEPOSED. And that every particular minister with assistants, according to the platform of that discipline, was himself a bishop, and had as great an authority within his own parish as any bishop in the world; might lawfully challenge, even to the excommunication of the best, as well princes as peasants, &c. Howbeit, many there were, as Dr. Cox, Dr. Horn, Mr. Jewel, with sundry others, who, perceiving the tricks of that discipline, did utterly dislike it." (pp. 45, 46.) So, in the *History of the Troubles at Frankfort* (pp. 44, 45), we find Knox making use of the following language towards this country: "Oh, England! England! if thou wilt obstinately return into Egypt, that is, if thou contract marriage, confederacy, or league with such princes as do maintain and advance idolatry, such as the emperor, who is not less than an enemy to Christ than was Nero; if for the pleasure and friendship, I say, of such princes, thou return to thine old abominations before used under papistry, then, assuredly, Oh England! thou shalt be plagued and brought to desolation by the means of those whose favour

thou seekest, and by whom thou art procured to fall from Christ, and serve antichrist " For these and such-like treasonable sentiments against the emperor, his son Philip, and queen Mary, Knox was compelled to fly to Frankfort, and was followed by some of his party. These turbulent spirits were in correspondence with their co-mates in England. It may here be proper to remark, that the reformers or gospellers were themselves the assertors of the right of the civil power to punish evil doers, and Calvin set the example by burning Servetus. It must not be forgotten too, that Cranmer was consenting to the death of Lambert and Anne Askew, under Henry the Eighth, and urged the young prince to sign the death warrant of Joan Bocher and Von Paris for HERESY. Nay, in a code of ecclesiastical discipline, compiled by Cranmer for the government of the reformed church of England, it was ordained that individuals accused of holding *heretical* opinions should be arraigned before the spiritual courts; should be excommunicated on conviction; and, after a respite of sixteen days, should, if they continued obstinate, be delivered to the civil magistrate, to SUFFER THE PUNISHMENT PROVIDED BY THE LAW. This code was levelled against the professors of the ANCIENT FAITH, for, by this new code, the doctrines of transubstantiation and supremacy, and the denial of justification by faith only, were made heresy, and of course would have subjected every Catholic to the punishment of death. The demise of Edward VI. put an end to this scheme of Cranmer to wreak his vengeance on the believers of that faith which he had repeatedly sworn to teach when it was his interest, and basely violated his solemn pledges when he could do it with safety to his neck. But only think, reader, of the consistency of those writers who clamour so loudly against the persecuting spirit of the Catholics, when the page of genuine history proves that the gospellers were as sanguinary towards Catholics as ever Catholics could be towards them. Besides, the Catholics did not invent their religion, but received it from the apostles and their successors, which religion, the scripture says, is un-

changeable and immutable. Whereas the religion, if such it can be called, of Cranmer and the gospellers was of human invention, ever varying and unsettled ; yet did he propose a code to burn those who should constantly adhere to the ONE invariable faith professed in England for nine hundred years before him ; but, in a short time, he and his associates fell into the trap he had contrived for others.

With whom the persecution originated in Mary's reign is, according to Dr. Lingard, a matter of uncertainty. Gardiner and Bonner have both been charged with cruelty, and as being the instigators of these lamentable proceedings ; but this learned writer has ably rescued the character of Gardiner from being of a mercenary disposition, and though it must be admitted that Bonner, from his situation, was compelled to pronounce a decree of heresy against a great number of the gospellers, yet it does not appear that he was a persecutor from choice, or went in search of victims, as the Protestants did, and were encouraged to do so, by rewards, in the time of Elizabeth, the "glorious" queen Bess, who was a more merciless tyrant than her father Henry. All that is known for certainty is, that the question of severe measures to reduce the restless spirit of the new preachers was frequently debated in council *after* the queen's marriage, but she was not apprized of their final resolution before the beginning of November, when she returned the following answer in writing :—" Touching the punishment of heretics, we thinketh it ought to be done *without rashness*, not leaving, in the mean time, to do justice to such as, by learning, would seem to deceive the simple ; and the rest so to be used, that the people will perceive them not to be condemned without just occasion ; by which they shall both understand the truth, and beware not to do the like. And especially within London, I would wish none to be burnt without some of the council's presence, and both there and every where good sermons at the same time." This we have on the authority of Collier, and certainly here is nothing of a spirit indicating a desire " to domineer over the rights of private judgment,

and trample on the privileges of mankind," which the modern editors charge this queen with harbouring. While these discussions were going on in council, an act was brought into parliament to revive the statutes which had formerly been enacted to suppress the doctrine of the Lollards. Every voice was in its favour, and, in the course of four days, it had passed the two houses. Here, then, was no shew of ignorance, nor any desire to violate the constitution of the country; on the contrary, the proceedings were perfectly constitutional and regular. The passing of this act alarmed the reformed preachers, many of whom were, at the time, in custody. They composed and forwarded petitions, including a confession of their faith, to the king and queen, and to parliament, and in which they made professions of loyalty. But while the preachers in prison professed submission to the laws, those who were at large acted with intemperance and outrage. On the 31st of December, one Ross, a celebrated preacher, openly prayed for the death of the queen. He was surprised in the fact, and taken to prison, with some of his disciples. Parliament immediately passed a law, making it treason to pray for the queen's death; while lying John Fox eulogizes these traitors as honest citizens, and bishop Hooper considered them as suffering saints.

We have seen, in our own days, the dreadful evils arising from heated imaginations, and the want of sterling religious principles to guide the opinions of political theorists. The horrors and dreadful outrages arising from the French revolution are fresh in every one's memory; nor can the modern editors of Fox be ignorant of the penal statutes that have been passed within the last forty years, to stop the progress of philosophical and unbelieving sophistry. Have not the British parliament made new laws of treason and sedition, and have not numerous individuals been punished with death and banishment under them? We have had gagging bills, power-of-imprisonment bills, sunset and sunrise bills, for Ireland, under which the poor peasant may be transported,

without trial by jury, for being out of his house a quarter-of-an-hour, and a distance of a quarter-of-a-mile, before sunrise or after sunset. We have had individuals tried and imprisoned for years for writings and publications tending to bring the Christian religion into contempt. We have had all these things done by our Protestant government, and in our own times: and are Catholics to be insulted by exaggerated tales of cruelty said to have been done three hundred years ago? The alleged motive of these modern proceedings was the preservation of "social order and holy religion;" the same motives were alleged by Mary's counsellors. The latter contended, that rigid justice was absolutely necessary to overawe that fanatical mob, and to quell the spirit of sedition.

Mary's counsellors, it must be observed, did not make *new* laws, nor forge *new* crimes, to punish her refractory subjects, as was the case with her father and brother, whose example was followed by her sister Elizabeth. These usurpers of the *spiritual* authority coined *creeds* as well as *crimes*, from mere caprice, and punished men, not for doing *wrong*, but for believing and adhering to that faith which was the *right* one. Mary's advisers contented themselves with reviving the ancient statutes of the land, which we will explain hereafter. The religion which the nation had again embraced, was the religion of their ancestors, and of the whole world. It had been introduced nine hundred years, by the force of persuasion and miracles, and was nurtured by the blood of the saints. Under it the most wholesome and equitable laws had been enacted to secure the rights and properties of every class of the community, both ecclesiastical and civil, and at no time was England more powerful and happy than when she submitted to the spiritual supremacy of the head of the Catholic church, and preserved the people from religious feuds and fanaticism. Until the time of Wickliffe, no penal law was passed concerning religious opinions, nor would there have been even after his doctrines began to spread, had they not been the cause of rebellion and bloodshed. We have, in the pre-



ceding part of this work, shewn the evil results of the Wickliffe heresy, but these results are carefully kept from the people by interested or prejudiced writers, who represent the professors of truth as cruel and sanguinary for attempting to stop the progress of error and delusion, and the disciples of error as the champions of truth. It was only on the 15th of December, 1825 (our birth-day, and St. Eusebius's day), that a London paper put forth an article which was headed, "*Penal Laws against Protestants, or Specimens of Ancient Catholic Legislation.*" The acts passed at the period alluded to might as well be alleged to have been passed against the modern philosophers of France as against Protestants, for there was not a Protestant in existence at the time the acts were made, as Wickliffe held the doctrine of the Mass, which Protestants deny, and swear that it is damnable idolatry. Consequently, Wickliffe was not a Protestant, though he and his disciples were condemned for preaching heterodoxy.

But allowing that Wickliffe was a Protestant, and "the true author of the Reformation," the Protestantism which he preached would no more be tolerated by our present Protestant government than it was by the government of the Plantagenets and Tudors. Most of our readers are acquainted with the insurrection of Wat Tyler and Jack Cade, but they are not so well acquainted with the cause of their rebellion. It arose chiefly from the pernicious notions imbibed by the people through the means of ignorant preachers, who went about the country dogmatizing against the clergy and their possessions, and instigating the people to dispossess them of their benefices. All men of letters were objects of hatred with these precursors of the Reformation, and it was found necessary to repress their tumultuous conduct by the strong arm of the law. On this occasion an act was passed in the year of Richard II. cap. i., which says: "Forasmuch as it is openly known, that there be divers *evil* persons within the realm, going from county to county, and from town to town, in certain habits, under *dissimulation of great holiness*, and without the licence of our holy father the pope, or other

*sufficient authority*, preaching daily, not only in churches and church-yards, but also in markets, fairs, and other open places, where a great congregation is, divers sermons, containing *heresies and notorious errors*, to the great blemishing of the Christian faith, and *destruction of the laws* and of the estate of the holy church, to the great peril of the souls of the people and of all the realm of England, &c.—which preachers, cited or summoned before the ordinaries of the places, there to answer of that whereof they be impeached, will not obey to their summons and commandments; nor care not for their monitions, nor the censures of the holy church, but expressly despise them; and moreover by *their subtle and ingenious words*, to draw the people to hear their sermons, and maintain them in *their errors* by *strong hand*, and by *great routs*, &c. —ENACTS, that persons indicted and accused of *such* heresy, should be committed to the ordinaries, and *openly tried*, and being *convicted*, should abjure and do penance, or suffer imprisonment, &c.”

We take this extract on Protestant authority, and we should be glad to know what objection can be made to the tenour of this act which will not apply to the penal statutes passed by Protestant parliaments; unless, indeed, it should be contended that people may act with impunity against Catholic rulers, but must be obedient in all things when Protestants are set over them. This law was not intended against men of godliness, but against “*evil persons*,” who *affected* great holiness, and harangued the people *without authority*, insinuating *heresy* among the ignorant, which, according to Dr. Johnson, means “an *opinion* of *private* men *different* from that of the Catholic and orthodox church,” and consequently were, as the act sets forth, “notorious errors,” disfiguring the truth, and menacing “destruction to the laws.” And is there a man of common sense, in this enlightened age, to be found condemning this statute of our Catholic forefathers, when the very same proceedings would be punished at this day, in this Protestant country, were the modern editors or any other stanch Protestants to tread in the steps of Wickliffe’s disciples.

Yes, in the United States of America would these precursors of the Reformation meet with a little wholesome castigation, though there is no state religion in that republic, if any of them were to act with open force as the Wickliffites were known to do, though this important fact is studiously suppressed by those writers who arraign the conduct of the Catholics in what they call the "dark ages." Does not this very law specify that these *new* pretenders to holiness and truth, after drawing the people into error by subtle, that is, sly, artful, cunning words, instigating them to maintain "their errors by *strong hand* and by *great routs*," which is manifestly contrary to the spirit of the Catholic religion, as that religion was spread, in every case, by the very opposite means to force and commotion, and when it was persecuted, those who professed it surrendered their lives rather than dishonour their faith by being guilty of the least violence.

But before we proceed further in our remarks, we must give from the same authority two extracts from the 2nd of Henry IV., who forcibly deposed the former sovereign, but found it necessary to guard against the evil doings of the precursors of the Reformation. The writer of the article says, this act of the last named monarch "more particularly defines the persons here spoken to be," it says, "*a new sect of the faith, of the sacraments of the church, and of the authority of the same damnable thinking, and against the law of God and of the church, usurping the offices of preaching, and who do perversely and maliciously, in divers places within the said realm, under the colour of dissembled holiness, preach and teach these days, openly and privily, divers new doctrines, and wicked heretical and erroneous opinions, contrary to the same faith and blessed determinations of the holy church; and of such sect and wicked doctrine and opinions, they make unlawful conventicles and confederacies, they hold and exercise schools, they do make and write books, they do wickedly instruct and inform people, and as much as they may excite and stir them to SEDITION and INSURRECTION,*" &c. And it "ordains, that persons con-

victed of *such* offences, and who shall refuse duly to abjure the same; or who, after abjuration shall be pronounced, do fall into relapse, so that according to the holy canons he ought to be left to the secular court; after due process, the mayor, sheriff or sheriffs, &c., of the place where the offence shall be committed, shall, after sentence, receive them before the people *in a high place, to be burnt*; that such punishment *may strike fear into the minds of others*, whereby *no such heretical doctrine*, nor their authors and fauters in the said realm against the Catholic faith, Christian law, and determination of the holy church, which *God prohibit*, be sustained or in any wise suffered."

From these extracts we find the same crimes of sedition and insurrection made the groundwork of the punishment, and the same cause named as producing these crimes, namely, hypocrisy in affecting piety, and perversity and malice in spreading their errors. The doctrines and opinions are denominated wicked, and the conventicles unlawful; now, had not our ancestors, though they were Catholics, as much right to guard against *wicked* errors as our Protestant government? We have had several acts passed within the last twenty years to prevent the holding of unlawful and seditious assemblies; and why should not Catholic parliaments be allowed to protect the peace and safety of the realm at the close of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries, against similar disturbers of the common weal, as Protestant parliaments in the nineteenth century? If the Protestant reader would divest himself of that prejudice imbibed by his education, and look to the two cases, with religion substracted from the first, he would find that had not our Catholic ancestors taken the precautions which they did to resist and destroy the pernicious subtilties and seditious practices of the Wickliffites, more generally known by the name of Lollards, the Protestants would not now have had any privileges to be alarmed for, lest the Catholics should regain the ascendancy and take away these rights from them. A circumstance which, if attempted in our time, we would oppose with all the energy of our mind.

We have shewn, to demonstration, that the two statutes of Richard II. and Henry IV. were not directed to invade the right of conscience, but to repress the exercise of force to benight and hold the mind in *error*, and prevent those dire calamities which naturally follow a state of insubordination and licentiousness among the people. Although punishment was enacted in the case of obstinacy and depravity, yet it does not follow that mild means were not resorted to, for the prevention of crime; and in fact no endeavour was left untried to bring the mistaken disciples of the *new* doctrines and *wicked* practices to a sense of their duty. That prevention, and not punishment, was the object of the rulers of those days, is unanswerably proved by the few executions that occurred under these two acts, which have been so much reprobated by Protestant writers, during the reign of the Catholic sovereigns, till the rule of that merciless bloody tyrant, Henry VIII., who became the first Protestant head of the church of England. Wickliffe himself died a natural death, the mischievous effect of his doctrines not appearing till after he had passed into the grave; of his followers not more than twenty-two suffered under the above laws, which were found necessary to be enacted, during the long space of 113 years, even according to John Fox himself, who includes in this number Sir John Oldecastle, a notorious traitor. Nor did Mary's advisers recommend the renewal of these laws, to glut their vengeance with the blood of the misguided and turbulent victims of delusion, but with a view to intimidate and restrain those tumultuous ebullitions which the seditious writings and preachings of the gospellers were fanning to a flame. We have before shewn that the queen received the greatest provocations to resort to harsh measures, which she forbore with a lenity hitherto unparalleled, and never yet followed. To this period not one had been punished for an offence touching religion. Those who suffered were convicted traitors, and but one, namely lady Jane Grey, was an object of pity with the people. This merciful forbearance, however, instead of gaining on the affections of the infatuated dis-



ciples of the gospellers, only tended to embolden them in their outrageous conduct; but what was evidently the feeling of charity, inspired by true religion, was mistaken for the effect of fear. Fresh provocations were given, and it was at length resolved to try what coercion would do to heal the disorders which now raged with so much excess. But this determination was not come to without opposition from some of the council. Cardinal Pole, who, as legate to the pope, represented the head of the Catholic church, was strenuous for mild measures. Dr. Heylin says the cardinal "was clearly of opinion, that they should rest themselves contented with the restitution of their own religion; that the said statutes should be held forth as a terror only, but that *no open persecution* should be raised upon them; following therein, as he affirmed, the counsel sent unto the queen by Charles the emperor, at her first coming to the crown, by whom she was advised to create no trouble unto any man for matter of conscience." Dr. Lingard also bears testimony to the clemency of the legate's disposition. "In a confidential letter to the cardinal of Augsburgh," writes that historian, "he has unfolded to us his own sentiments without reserve. He will not, he says, deny that there may be men, so addicted to the most pernicious errors themselves, and so apt to *seduce others*, that they may justly be put to death, for the same purpose as we amputate a limb to preserve the body. But this is an extreme case: and, even when it happens, every gentler remedy should be applied before such punishment is inflicted. In general, lenity is to be preferred to severity: and the bishops should remember that they are fathers as well as judges, and ought to shew the tenderness of parents, even when they are compelled to punish. This has always been his opinion; it was that of his colleagues, who presided with him at the council of Trent, and also of the prelates who composed that assembly." The lord chancellor, Gardiner, is said by Dr. Heylin to have differed from the legate, and to have contended for the enforcing of the statutes on the principal supporters of the heretics, whether

they were of the ecclesiastical hierarchy or the lay nobility ; and bishop Bonner is represented by the same authority as furious in favour of persecution, which he justified, the doctor says, by precedent from the evangelists or gospellers themselves. "Have I not seen [saith he] that the heretics themselves have broke the ice, in putting one of their own number (I think they called him by name of Servetus) to a cruel death ? Could it be thought no crime in them to take that more severe course against one of their brethren, for holding any contrary doctrine from that which they had publicly agreed amongst them ? And can they be so silly, or so partial rather, as to reckon it for a crime in us, if we proceed against them with the like severity, and punish them by the most extreme rigour of their own example ? " Cranmer too, be it observed and never forgotten, was an advocate for persecution even of Protestants, or such as are now called so, he having laboured with Ridley to instil into the youthful mind of Edward, " that as Moses ordered blasphemers to be put to death, so it was the duty of a Christian prince, and more so of one who bore the title of *defender of the faith*, to eradicate the cockle from the field of God's church, to cut out the gangrene that it might not spread to the sounder parts."—(*Rym.* xv. 182.) Elizabeth, also—that darling she-pope and foundress of the established church ; she who is hailed with the title of " virgin queen," and " glorious Bess," while her sister Mary is denominated the " bloody " queen—this sweet lady could issue out her commissions for *burning heretics*, in one of which, to Sir Nicholas Bacon, she says : " They have been justly declared heretics, and therefore, as corrupt members, to be cut off from the rest of the flock of Christ, lest they should corrupt others professing the true Christian faith..... We, therefore, according to regal function and office, minding the execution of justice in this behalf, require you to award and make out our writ of execution," &c.—(*Rym.* xv. 740.) From these facts it is clear that both parties seem to have been agreed in the right of the *secular* power to put heretics to death, and as we have proved that the legate, cardinal Pole, as well as

others, was opposed to severe measures, it is not too much to expect of the Protestant reader, that he will acquit the Catholic church of holding persecuting doctrines, which she really does not admit, when persecution has been practised to a much greater degree and with less shew of justice by Protestants than by Catholics. Because the latter adhere to *one* only divine faith, whereas the former admit the right of every individual to choose his own individual opinion, and then punish him for so doing!

The council having decided on strong measures, on the 22nd of January, 1555, the chancellor called before him the chief of the prisoners, put them in mind of the tendency of the statutes revived in the last parliament, and admonished them to avoid the punishment that would succeed a spirit of contumacy. A few days after the court was opened, at which Gardiner presided, and thirteen bishops were present, with a number of lords and knights. The presence of the latter plainly shews that the court was not exclusively ecclesiastic. Six prisoners were called before them; of these, Hooper, the deprived bishop of Gloucester; Rogers, a prebendary of St. Paul's; Saunders, rector of Allhallows, in London; and Taylor, rector of Hadley, in *Suffolk*, according to Dr. Lingard's testimony, but of *Hertford*, if we are to credit Heylin; refused to subscribe to the Catholic doctrine. One of the others feigned a recantation; and the sixth petitioned for time, which was granted. A delay of twenty-four hours was allowed the first four; and on their second refusal they were excommunicated. The excommunication was followed by the delivery of the prisoners to the civil power. Here we will just observe, that the proceedings do not appear to have been conducted with haste and severity. Although we disapprove of the mixing up religious questions with political crimes, still justice ought to be done to the persecutors as well as to the persecuted, and such was the nature of the doctrines taught by the gossellers that it was next to an impossibility to separate the two subjects in the case of these offenders. Rogers was the first of the four that was executed,

and he was burned in Smithfield on the 4th of February. Gardiner from this time declined all further attendance, and his place was occupied by Bonner. This latter prelate, on the 9th of the same month, accompanied by the lord mayor and sheriffs, and several members of the council, excommunicated six other prisoners, and turned them over to the civil power. On the day following, however, a circumstance occurred which should never be forgotten, in justice to the parties, but which is wilfully suppressed by those who are led by their prejudices to calumniate and vilify the Catholic church. A Spanish friar, named Alphonso di Castro, and confessor to king Philip, was ordered to preach before the court, and to the astonishment of his hearers, but to his own immortal honour, condemned the harsh proceedings just adopted in the most pointed and severe manner. He pronounced them to be in direct opposition not only to the text, but to the spirit of the gospel: it was not by severity, he said, but by mildness, that men were to be brought into the fold of Christ; and it was the duty of the bishops not to seek the death, but to instruct the ignorance, of their misguided brethren. "Men were at a loss," says Dr. Lingard, "to account for this discourse, whether it were the spontaneous effort of the friar, or had been suggested to him by the policy of Philip, or by the humanity of the cardinal, or by the repugnance of the bishops. It made, however, a deep impression: the execution of the prisoners was suspended: the question was again debated in the council; and five weeks elapsed before the advocates of severity could obtain permission to rekindle the fires of Smithfield." Nor would they in all probability have been rekindled, had not the turbulent spirit of the gossellers provoked the court to resume harsh measures. That Mary had no desire to "domineer over the right of private judgment, and trample on the privileges of mankind," as the modern editors of Fox unjustly accuse her of, she about this time released Courtney, the earl of Devonshire, from confinement, and he, with Elizabeth, repaired to Hampton Court, to enjoy the festivities of Easter with the

queen The bishops too were very reluctant to take upon themselves the odious task of calling the prisoners before them, and it was not till Bonner had received a reprimand, through the instigation of the new marquis of Winchester, who, in the former reign, was a pious gospeller, but had now become the most furious persecutor, that the fires were again lighted. And they were made to blaze more freely from the riotous proceeding of the fanatical imbibers of evangelism.

In the month of March a new conspiracy was detected, which had been organized in the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cambridge. On Easter Sunday, Stowe says, a priest, sometime a monk of Ely, and also of Bicester, named William Branch, *alias* Flower, wounded another priest with a knife, as he was administering the sacrament to the people in St. Margaret's church at Westminster: for which deed the said William Flower, on the 24th of April, had his right hand cut off, and for opinions in matters of religion was burned in St. Margaret's church-yard. Dr. Heylin likewise says: "Though Wyatt's party was so far suppressed as not to shew itself visibly in open action, yet such as formerly had declared for it, or wished well unto it, had many secret writings against the queen, every day growing more and more in dislike of her government, by reason of so many butcheries as were continually committed under her authority. Upon which ground, as they had formerly instructed Elizabeth Crofts to act the spirit in the wall, so afterwards they trained up one William Constable, *alias* Featherstone, to take upon himself the name of king Edward, whom he was said to resemble both in age and personage. And thus they did in imitation of the like practice used in the time of king Henry VI. by Richard Plantagenet, duke of York, who, when he had a mind to claim the title to the crown, in regard of his descent by the house of Mortimer, from Lionel of Antwerp, duke of Clarence, he caused one Jack Cade (a fellow altogether as obscure as this) to take upon himself the name of Mortimer, that he might see how well the people stood affected unto his pretensions, by the discovery which



might be made thereof, on this false alarm. And though this Featherstone had been taken and publicly whipped for it, in May last past, and thereupon banished into the north, where he had been born, yet the confederates resolved to try their fortune with him in a second adventure. The design was to raise the people, under colour of king Edward being alive; and, at the same time, to rob the exchequer, wherein they knew, by some intelligence or other, that £50,000, in good Spanish money, had been lodged." To these provocations may be added, the licentious spirit of the preachers of the new opinions, who heaped upon the queen, the prelates, her council, and her religion, every opprobrious and indecent epithet that the fury of man, or the malice of hell, could devise. Tracts, filled with the most abominable and treasonable matter, were industriously sent over by the exiles in Germany, and as sedulously circulated through the kingdom by the disaffected at home. During this period the queen was led to believe, from appearances, that she was pregnant, and preparations were made for her accouchement. Prayers were offered for her safe delivery, but it afterwards turned out that her situation was occasioned by bodily disease. This disappointment was the occasion of great rejoicings by her enemies, who indulged themselves in sarcasms, epigrams, and lampoons. Under such circumstances, it cannot be a subject of wonder that the fires of Smithfield and elsewhere were rekindled; our astonishment is only excited that so great a degree of forbearance was manifested, which, we conceive, must be taken by every unbiassed mind, as a proof of the great clemency of Mary's disposition.

Exasperated and goaded by the seditious spirit of the new lights, Mary's council unfortunately resolved on an endeavour to strike terror into the deluded, and accordingly Ridley and Latimer were ordered to be burned. These leaders of the new opinions, and instigators to fanaticism, suffered on the 16th of October, 1555. Cranmer was next called forth. He had seen his two friends led to execution from the window of his cell, and the sight made him relent; but he recovered him-

self, and wrote a long letter to the queen in defence of his doctrine, which, at Mary's request, was answered by cardinal Pole. News was now received from Rome that Cranmer had been formally condemned by the pope, Paul IV., in a private consistory, and the usual sentence pronounced. Cranmer was again alarmed; he had no inclination to meet death. To save his life, he therefore recanted, and openly condemned his errors. In no less than *seven* instruments, gentle reader, did this bepraised martyr of the Protestant sect or sects abjure the opinions he had taught, and approve of the faith which he had opposed. But all would not now do. He had been long a convicted traitor, though his life had been spared. He was now a condemned heretic, and, as such, looked upon as an enemy to God and man. We must give it as our opinion, that it would have been better to have spared his life, that he might have sincerely repented of his errors, but as we did not live in those turbulent times, we are not competent to decide whether the incitements given were not sufficient to justify the putting this hoary traitor to death. But we here again repeat—and it cannot be too often impressed upon the mind of the Protestant reader—that heresy, especially when accompanied with sedition and rebellion, as was the case with the Wickliffites, and the Protestant gospellers in Mary's reign, was always looked upon as a heinous crime against the *state*, as well as a grievous sin against Almighty God. That, in consequence, the legislature of this country enacted the civil penalties, although the bishops, as the judges of doctrine, were called upon to examine those who were suspected of it. Thus, then, those who suffered were punished by the statutes of the *realm*, and not by the canons of the *church*; therefore, it is both cruel and unjust to charge Catholics, as Catholics, with the severities of Mary's reign, which were caused by motives of policy, arising out of the commotions and treasons of the guilty parties who suffered. As well might Catholic nations lay the late massacre at Manchester, or the number of the executions in the last thirty years, at

the door of the Protestant church of England, as the modern editors, or any other bigotted writers, impute the burnings in Mary's reign to the principles of the Catholic church. Even in the case of Cranmer, the holy father Paul, who was as jealous of his prerogatives as any pontiff that ever filled the papal throne, in his decree of Cranmer's condemnation, directed to Philip and Mary, only requires them "to deal with him, after he is delivered up to the *secular* court, as THE LAW directs," without conveying the slightest intimation of any corporeal punishment. Cranmer was judged a fit criminal for THE LAW to take its course, and he was ordered for execution. The writ for this purpose expressly says, that the criminal, being condemned for heresy, and degraded—as the CHURCH *neither had*, nor OUGHT to proceed any farther in the affair—he was delivered over to the king and queen, *according to the laws and customs of the REALM provided in such cases*, and condemned to be burned, in detestation of his guilt, and for a *warning* to other Christians. On the 21st of March, Cranmer was led out to execution, where he recalled, to the astonishment of the people, all his former recantations, which, he said, had been wrung from him by the hope of life. His sufferings were short, as the flames rapidly ascended over his head, and he expired in a few moments. Fox has a story about his heart remaining unconsumed after his body was reduced to ashes, but there is no authority produced to bear out his assertion. If such had been the case, what had become of it, after such a miraculous preservation? Was there not one disciple to secure the false heart of this falsest of traitors and bishops, and hand it down for the admiration of Protestant devotees and bigots.

Two hundred and seventy persons are stated by Fox to have suffered the same punishment during Mary's reign, but this account is exaggerated, and many deductions are to be made for those who died as felons and traitors; also for such as were found to be *alive* after the publication of Fox's Calendar; and likewise those who would have been sent to

the fire by Cranmer himself, had he been in power. Of the last there was a very great number, which Father Parsons has pointed out in his *Examination of Fox's Calendar*. Of the former were W. Flower, who stabbed the priest at the altar at St. Margaret's; W. Gardiner, who was executed at Lisbon for attempting to assassinate the cardinal prince Henry while officiating at the altar; and the three famous Guernsey women, whom Parsons proves to have been prostitutes and guilty of theft. One of them was the mother of the pretended infant martyr, concerning whom such violent outeries were raised. Of those who were found living after the first edition of Fox's work came out, Anthony Wood, the Oxford historian, relates, that one Grimwood was actually present in a church when the clergyman was describing, on the authority of Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, the circumstances of his (Grimwood's) supposed miserable and preternatural death, "his bowels, by the judgment of God, falling out of his body in consequence." Grimwood, however, finding his bowels still in his body, brought an action against the clergyman—for we suppose Fox was out of his reach—for defamation.

That the persecution was not general, but chiefly confined to the metropolis and its vicinity—the usual seat of restless demagogues and discontented incendiaries—is strikingly clear by the few that suffered in the different parts of the kingdom. Not one was put to death in the diocese of Canterbury, after cardinal Pole was appointed to that see; only one in that of York, of which Dr. Heath was archbishop, and very few in the four Welch dioceses; one in each of those of Wells, Exeter, Peterborough, and Lincoln; two in that of Ely; three in each of those of Bristol and Salisbury; and none in those of Oxford, Gloucester, Worcester, and Hereford, according to the testimony of Dr. Heylin.

While these scenes of death were going on, to strike awe among the infatuated gossellers, Mary was not unmindful of the wants of the church, and accordingly she directed the attention of her ministers to the condition of the poor clergy.

On the opening of her parliament, after assuring the lay possessors of church property that they had nothing to apprehend, she restored the property of the church, then in the hands of the crown, and called upon the commons' house for a subsidy. It was the first that she had ever asked of her subjects, so frugal had she been in her wants. It was proposed to grant two-fifteenths, with a subsidy of four shillings in the pound; but Mary, by a message, declined the two-fifteenths, and was content with a subsidy of less amount than what was originally proposed. The editors of Fox *may* term this a "narrowness of spirit," but it is such a one as the people would be glad to see followed by the present ministers, who, being staunch Protestants, have certainly not exhibited a narrowness of spirit in raising loans, granting pensions, and imposing taxes, by which the people are reduced to a state of poverty and misery, not much unlike the days of Edward VI., when the monasteries were destroyed, the tithes appropriated solely to the parson, and the poor left to shift for themselves as well as they could. By the bill introduced and passed, Mary gave up the tenths and first fruits, &c., vested in the crown by the 20th of Henry VIII., producing a yearly revenue of 60,000*l.* for the augmentation of small livings, the support of preachers, and the furnishing of exhibitions to scholars in the universities. Here was a nobleness of spirit which it would be well if Protestant sovereigns were to imitate, as their people would feel less the weight of the state clergy than they do now-a-days. But the delirium into which the people had then been worked would not allow them to appreciate Mary's good intentions towards them. The death of the lord chancellor, Gardiner, emboldened the gospellers to renew their machinations against the government; secret meetings were now held, infamous libels on their majesties were scattered about the streets, and even in the precincts of the palace; and a new conspiracy was formed, which had for its object to depose Mary and place her sister Elizabeth on the throne. Taking this state of things into consideration, is it, we again ask, any matter for astonishment that severe measures were



pursued against the gossellers and their preachers? Elizabeth was again proved to have been concerned in this traitorous design, and again pardoned. A fresh conspiracy was attempted, and a disposition was shewn by Elizabeth to fly into France, fearing she might be at length detected and punished. Troubles now succeeded troubles, and Mary began to droop in health and spirits. The absence of her husband Philip on the continent, the unquenched fanaticism of the people, the death of her able and honest minister, Gardiner, but, above all, the loss of Calais, which had been so long an appendage to the crown of England, preyed on her mind, and shook a constitution naturally delicate. Like the Catholic sovereigns who preceded her, she had the honour of England at heart, and consequently felt the loss of so important a fortress as Calais most poignantly. Still she met her parliament, she saw the spirit of the nation roused, but she could not rally her own fortitude. On her death-bed she told her attendants that if her breast were opened, the word "Calais" would be found engraven on her heart. The reign of Mary was now about to close. Exhausted both in mind and body, for the exiles in Geneva continued to increase the number and virulence of their libels against her, she was removed from Hampton Court to St. James's, when she was found to be attacked with a fever which had proved fatal to thousands of her subjects. Under this disease she languished for three months, but never recovered sufficiently to leave her apartment.

"During this long confinement," writes Dr. Lingard, "Mary edified all around her by her cheerfulness, her piety, and her resignation to the will of Providence. Her chief solicitude was for the stability of that church which she had restored; and her suspicions of Elizabeth's insincerity prompted her to require from her sister an avowal of her real sentiments. In return Elizabeth complained of Mary's incredulity. She was a true and conscientious believer in the Catholic creed; nor could she do more now than she had repeatedly done before, which was to confirm her assertion

with her oath. To the duke of Feria, who had come on a visit to the queen from her husband, the princess made the same declaration: and so convinced was that nobleman of her sincerity, that he not only removed the doubts of Mary, but assured Philip that the succession of Elizabeth would cause no alteration in the worship now established by law." In a note to this passage, the historian adds, on the authority of the duchess of Feria, that Elizabeth "prayed God that the earth might open and swallow her alive if she were not a true Roman Catholic." Before Mary's death, which happened on the 17th of November, 1558, she sent one of her maids of honour, Jane Dormer, afterwards duchess of Feria, to deliver to the princess Elizabeth the jewels in her custody, and to make three requests from her: namely, that she would be good to her servants, would repay the money which had been lent on the privy seals, and would support the Catholic religion. Mass was said on the morning of her death in her chamber, and she expired a few minutes before its conclusion. Cardinal Pole survived her only twenty-four hours.

We have dwelt long on the reign of this unfortunate queen, but not longer than was necessary to vindicate her injured character. Though short in duration, the lies and calumnies that have been forged and heaped upon the memory of Mary, and through her cast upon the Catholics and their religion, have been gross and innumerable, and demanded a full refutation. In accomplishing this task we are happy in having the assistance of a Protestant writer, Mr. Brewer, who, though not generally known, has most ably defended this virtuous but ill-fated princess, and we think it but justice to the author and our readers to give his letter, or rather, "*Hints respecting the real character of Mary, queen of England,*" from the *Universal Magazine*, vol. ix. 1808, p. 396. He says:—

"The motives for partiality and causes for detraction among historians of every nation, but particularly England, where convulsions in religion and politics have been perpetually occurring, and where *party* has raged with proverbial

illiberality at almost every period, would appear too obvious to admit the possibility of implicit reliance in even the cursory reader, did not experience assure us that not only the interested but dispassionate are hourly the dupes of the vilest calumny or most egregious adulation.

“The increasing candour of the latter eras of literature has nobly endeavoured, in many instances, to remove that meretricious veil from the face of historic truth, with which venality had shaded her instructive features. The spirit of “*Historic Doubts*” (by *Lord Orford*) has stimulated an inquiry into the genuine failings and pretensions of the unfortunate Scottish beauty, whose head not even a diadem could preserve from the block and scaffold; but still the English sovereign, of the same name, though of more splendid fortunes, remains the victim of declamatory detestation and merciless tyranny. The examination of this reign, by some scholar at once inquisitive and unprejudiced, I hold a desideratum in English literature; and should feel particular pleasure if this remonstrance, through the medium of your impartial publication, calls forth a pen adequate to the task, wielded by a hand which knows no enthusiasm, except such as a love of veracity innoxiously engenders.

“Should a writer generously step forward, he will not droop for want of materials. At the very outset he will perceive the evident possibility of misrepresentation respecting this reign, when he finds that its historians have been men of an opposite (though confessedly of a more correct and desirable) religious persuasion. Taking natural probability for his guide, he will maintain the reasonableness of supposing that a writer, whose aim was the gratification of popular credulity, would rather concentrate his invective on one defenceless head, than venture on the attack of a numerous and well-lettered party, whose descendants, if themselves had sunk to the peaceful bourne where contest is no more, would be found ready to retort the abuse to the vexation, if not discomfiture, of the assailant.

“Thus will he be tempted to transfer from queen Mary

to her advisers a portion of that outcry which party first set up, and which credulity echoes, to the discredit of philanthropy, good sense, and the mild tenets of the Christian doctrine.

“ When Mary came to the crown she found the state in the most perilous condition (as far as regarded individual conduct) that possibly could exist for a zealot in any particular mode of faith. Her father, in the plenitude of his caprice, and at the suggestion of his avarice, had thrown off the papal power, and commenced champion of the new cause. Not contented with the wealth, he rioted in the blood, of the overthrown Papists. The scene is too melancholy to admit an enumeration of the victims. Fire, fagot, and the halter, were administered with an unsparing hand ! As a sample, suffice it to observe, that, at one massacre, More, Fisher, and eleven monks, were beheaded for denying the king's supremacy !

“ Edward VI., from the simple circumstance of his adolescence occurring while his august father was in a Protestant mood, received an education from persons directed to instruct him in the reformed religion. During his short reign, accordingly, the foot was still kept on the neck of the Roman Catholic party ; and they remained disgraced, in penury, and danger. No scaffolds were built for the express purpose of decapitating the noble Papists, nor gibbets erected for the death of the meaner sort, but an act was passed of the most horrible and oppressive cruelty. The poor wandering monks and ejected friars were, at this time, supported by the private alms of those who did not dare openly to entertain them. To drive them from the miserable corners in which they hovered, it was enacted, that if any person should loiter for three days together without offering himself for hire as a labourer, he should be adjudged as a slave, for two years, to the first informer, and should be marked on the breast with the letter V. for vagabond, The mark to be made with a hot iron.

“ Whether Protestant or Papist, man is still subject to the

passions of human nature ; and revenge, of all passions the most terrific, and in history the most frequent, even Christianity, under its more favourable modification, is unable to suppress. Perhaps, therefore, a candid and benignant Protestant, now that all violent dissension between the two parties has long since ceased, will scarcely feel surprise at the severity with which those of the ejected persuasion conducted themselves, on a sudden and nearly unexpected restoration to power. Be that as it may, humanity had already blushed for the triumphant Protestants ; a blush of a still deeper dye must assuredly glow on her cheek while beholding the unlimited vengeance which their opponents inflicted, when the dangerous talisman of power reversed the tumultuous scene, and recalled the friars from manual labour, or the mortification of the proscribed brand, to their stalls, their mass-books, and all the scattered parade of their glittering rituals. But in the detestable operations which now took place, why is the torch ever placed by the historian in one hand ? Is it likely that a single female should possess more rancour than all the heads of a disjointed church, inflamed with personal pique, impoverished by expulsion from their benefices, and inflated by a bigotry of the most decisive nature ? Our historians, in this instance, have studied, like the tragic poet, to bring one person forward in the drama, in order to exhibit all the tremendous beauties of contrast. In strict conformity to the pernicious system of dressing up their characters like puppets, either strikingly attractive or utterly deformed, the dramatic recorders who assume the name of historians, studiously decorate Edward VI. with those clement qualities which they describe his sister as wanting ; and freely place all the ignominy of that unprecedented act, the branding of the ejected friars, to the account of his advisers. In this latter procedure they are unquestionably correct. Few persons feel on subjects of religious ascendancy with the acuteness of those who, by their ' sacred calling,' look on church power as the highest object of mundane interest ; and, therefore, to his advisers let us freely attribute all the asperity of



the hostile edicts which passed in the short reign of this juvenile sovereign. But, admitting the justice of this appropriation, why shall we deny Mary the same indulgence? Edward was surrounded by churchmen, and as they advised, he acted; his successor stood in the same predicament, and acted in the same way. If it be objected, that difference of years enabled queen Mary to conduct the government with greater judgment and decision, it may be answered, that her feminine education (for she had not, in any view, the advantages, in this weighty respect, of Elizabeth) reduced her nearly to the level of her youthful brother. From infancy to maturity churchmen were her guides and præceptors; and nearly every action of her life proves that she had learned to sacrifice her opinions habitually to those of her guardians.

“Our historians have an ungracious custom of illustrating the character of their *dramatis personæ* by comparison. Mary they invidiously place by the side of Elizabeth; and while they lavish panegyric on the brow of the ‘Virgin Queen,’ they solicit the reader’s abhorrence of her unhappy foil—not by argument, but by the epithets of ‘blood-thirsty Mary!’ and ‘sanguinary tyrant!’ The management of the state this misguided princess appears to have left to the ecclesiastics. The management of her family the bishops likewise imperiously solicited; but in this solitary instance Mary was inflexible; and as I think an examination of her conduct in this particular essential to the right understanding of her character, permit me, from authentic documents, though testimonies too much neglected by our historical writers, to develope it.

“In regard to Elizabeth, it will be recollected that Mary did not stand in a situation pointedly dissimilar to that in which Elizabeth herself was afterwards placed with Mary Queen of Scots. As it appears to me, the conduct of the two sisters in this predicament would, if related with impartiality, redound, by comparison (to adopt the historical fashion), to the high honour of the elder,

“The behaviour of Elizabeth (though some minute cir-

cumstances may admit of controversy) is too well known to need in this place any resemblance of a prolix detail. Mary's chief offence, except precedence in personal beauty, was her right of heirship to the crown, for which Elizabeth hated and feared her. Mary threw herself on her kinswoman's protection, and was imprisoned, with circumstances of severity incredible, if not authenticated. A rumour of conspiracy was spread, and she was put to death.

“Elizabeth was also heir to the crown, and was accused, by Sir Thomas Wyatt, of a conspiracy against her sister's government. Thus, even in respect to political motives, was Mary as strongly tempted to rid herself of the danger of a rival caballer, as was afterwards the ‘Virgin Queen.’ But the first ardent wish of the queen was defeated, and that by her sister, for the earl attached himself to the princess: the queen was slighted, and Elizabeth triumphed.

“The ancient quarrel between their mothers likewise must be supposed not quite forgotten in the breast of the ruling party: especially when the great share Anne Boleyn took in the Reformation is duly considered: yet these two circumstances conjoined were insufficient to provoke her to that foul crime which Elizabeth taught the world, on a future occasion, how to commit without a blush. It is true the rivalry of Elizabeth caused the queen to look with coolness on her; and therefore the princess retired to her house of Ashbridge, in Hertfordshire, but the style in which she there resided may be gathered from the parade with which she entered London, when summoned thither on account of the accusation of Sir Thomas Wyatt. ‘Between four and five of the clock at night,’ says a MS. quoted in *Nichols' Progresses*, ‘my lady Elizabeth's grace came to London, through Smithfielde, untoo Westminster, with a hundred velvet cotts after her grace. And her grace rode in a charytt open on both sides; and her grace had ryding after her, a hundred in cotts of fine redde, gardyd with velvett,’ &c. With this pomp was the person conducted to London who was accused of conspiring against her sister's life. Surely a sanguinary tyrant should be made of ‘sterner stuff.’

“As so much publicity of grandeur was allowed to the princess on her entry, it is but just to conclude that she could not satisfactorily exonerate herself from the heavy charge preferred against her, when more strenuous measures were resorted to. This supposition is strengthened by the deliberation with which the circumstances were investigated, as she remained a fortnight at court before she was ordered to the Tower. While in confinement, under the suspicion of treasonable practices, though at first she was attended duly by the lieutenant's servants, yet suddenly an order came for her table to be served by a part of her own establishment, viz., two yeomen of her chamber, one of her robes, two of her pantry and ewry, one of her buttery, one of her cellar, another of her larder, and two of her kitchen. By all but the prejudiced it must be admitted probable that the first indignity offered the princess was by command of the privy council, at whose head was bishop Gardiner; and that on her applying to the queen for a respectful attendance, her wish was immediately granted. It is certain that Mary received letters from her at this juncture, as one is quoted by Camden in his *Elizabeth*.

“When Wyatt, at the place of execution, made confessions favourable to the character of Elizabeth, she was released from the Tower and conveyed to Woodstock, where she was lodged in a chamber ‘curiously carved and painted blue sprinkled with gold.’ We can scarcely avoid supposing that her confinement here was not the most dreary imaginable, since, when queen, she was particularly attached to this palace as a residence, and Bedingfield, her ‘jailor,’ whom history represents in all the terrific colours of the hired assassin, with a scowling brow, a curled lip, and a hand ever grasping a dagger, which points to a poisoned bowl—this horrible janitor *she visited* during her progress in 1578, and was in the habit of receiving frequently at court! To common sense I propose the queries:—Is it likely that a female, possessed of sovereign power, would fondly visit the prison in which she had often slept under the horrible dread of assassination? And could human lenity so far conquer the natural suggestions

of repugnance, as to allow the possibility of a voluntary and convivial intercourse with the wretch from whose poinard she had escaped by chances little short of miracles? The prison-room, iron-bars, assassin, bowl of hemlock, &c., were the offspring of Fox's poetical imagination. From Fox, Holinshed transcribes; and Holinshed succeeding historians refer to as an authority! Such is the basis of historical assertion!

"But the part of queen Elizabeth's story rendered most dramatic by the legend-bearers is the circumstance of her being removed from a PRISON to a throne. Here is a contrast in perfection. A frightful excavated recess on the one hand, with bolts and bars rusted by noxious vapours: on the other, a crown, the dazzling rays of diamonds, the homage of the world, the possession of absolute power. In the background (a striking figure!) behold 'blood-thirsty Mary!' In dreadful secesy she sharpens the knife intended to pierce, in the dark solitude of a dungeon, the bosom of her enchained sister! The vizor would be highly attractive, says the fable, if it had brains; and this story would be extremely interesting, if it were true.

"The *prison* from which Elizabeth was moved on the death of her sister, was, it may be recollected, the palace of Hatfield. Here she had a retinue and establishment befitting her exalted rank. An extract from a curious MS. chronicle, describes one of her entertainments as 'a great and rich maskinge, wher the pageants were marvellously furnished. There were thar twelve ministrels, antiely disguised, with forty-six, or more, gentlemen and ladies, many of them knights or nobles; and there was a devise of a castell of cloth of gold, &c. At night the cupboard in the hall was of twelve stages, mainlie furnished with garnish of gold and silver vessul, and a banket of seventie dishes, &c. The next day the play of Holophernes was performed.'

"Not only were the personal expenses of the princess unlimited, and her liberty entire, but she was allowed to maintain a sort of court at Hatfield, and possessed a palace in town. Strype tells us, that, on such a day, 'the lady

Elizabeth came riding from her house at Hatfield, to London, *attended with a great companie of lords, and noblemen, and gentlemen*, unto her palace, called Somerset place, beyond Strand bridge, to do her duty to the queen.' In another part he says: 'That aforenoon the lady Elizabeth's grace took her horse, and rode to her palace at Shene, with many lords, knights, ladies, and gentlemen, and a goodlie company of horse (*i. e.* attendants).'

"Her visits to court were far from infrequent, and her entertainment there, now that she preserved herself from all suspicion of political intrigue, was friendly and magnificent. In one of her visits she went by water in the queen's barge, which was richly hung with garlands of artificial flowers, and covered with a canopy of the most costly description. Six boats attended the procession, filled with her highness's retinue, habited in russet-damask, and blue embroidered satin, spangled with silver. On Christmas Eve the great hall of the palace was illuminated with a thousand lamps, curiously disposed. The princess supped at the same table in the hall with the king and queen, next to the cloth of state. On the 29th day of December, she sat with their majesties at a grand spectacle of justing, &c.

"From these brief quotations the nature of Mary's severity towards her sister must fully appear; and the drama of history be proved deficient in all but poetical justice. Would the woman who treated an offensive sister with so much real generosity, have beheaded Mary, queen of Scots?

"The invidious comparison between the sister-queens, suggested by most historians, and admired by many readers, surely, in this particular, defeats its own purpose. On a strict and fair parallel, Mary would be found deficient in two instances, which unhappily rendered nearly useless that natural integrity of heart which, from her demeanour towards Elizabeth, I must believe she possessed. She was inferior in strength of mind, and in those qualifications which are the result of instruction. It is well known that the Papists of this distant age were not fond of disseminating



learning among the laity ; and the priests from whom Mary received her education had a particular and obvious interest in preserving her in such a state of mental deficiency as would render her a more obedient instrument of their wishes, should she ever attain supremacy in the state. On every occasion Mary's want of expanded views and extensive information may readily be detected. In no one instance did she ever exhibit proofs even of natural shrewdness, or untutored political ability. Is it not then equitable to place her acquiescence in religious cruelty, which marked her reign, rather to her want of independence of sentiment, than to such a constitutional barbarity as would entitle her to the appellation of a sanguinary tyrant? When we view the extreme forbearance with which she acted in regard to Elizabeth, so truly offensive in so many particulars, we must be bigots, though in an opposite direction to Mary, if we persist in thinking otherwise.

“ If (intent on preserving the stigma which historians have affixed to the name of this unfortunate princess) it is contended that Elizabeth was saved from destruction purely by the interference of Philip, Mary's husband, I reply, that in no instance, on valid authority, can this be proved the case : but even admitting the possibility of such a presumption being correct, it must assuredly strengthen the grounds on which I affirm that scarcely an act of Mary's reign was the result of her personal inclination. Since, if she spared her most offensive foe, whether we look on the enmity as religious or otherwise, at the solicitation of a man who had not individual power to command, certainly, without determined to be impartial or unjust, we must suppose that she was equally undeterminate on all other subjects to which her assent was necessary.

“ But Sir Thomas Wyatt's conspiracy (a rare opportunity for ridding herself of her rival, if such a purpose had occupied her mind) occurred before her marriage. From this peril therefore, of course, Elizabeth was not preserved by her brother-in-law. Philip was likewise absent in Spain for a

considerable period, and a sanguinary tyrant would scarcely have failed to profit by his absence. A thousand hands only waited for her signal to stretch Elizabeth a corpse on the floor of that Hertfordshire palace, which, by favour of a poetical license, our historians are pleased to term a dungeon.

“Should any writer undertake the history of this reign, with the generous wish of eliciting truth, he will find more MS. chronicles to assist his labour than would the narrator of any other remote period of our history; and I repeat that, from Mary's conduct in regard to Elizabeth, accurately investigated, he will be able to exhibit her personal character in a light quite different from that in which it has usually been placed.”

The liberal sentiments thus expressed by this Protestant writer do equal credit to his head and heart. He has most triumphantly vindicated Mary's character from the charge of *blood-thirstiness*, so cruelly and unjustly lavished on her by bigotted and unprincipled writers. We must, however, differ from the opinion he has formed of Mary's education, which we think did not restrict her mental faculties, nor did she display any deficiency in the exercise of her intellectual capacities, more than the constitutional sovereign does to the capricious tyrant. Mary followed the principles of justice, according to the rule of her ancestors; Elizabeth knew no other system than that of expediency and her own despotic will. Mary's letters to her brother Edward, the lords of the council, her discourse with Ridley, and other documents preserved by Dodd, in his *Church History*, by no means betray a want of political or theoretical ability.

Desirous to place on record the most unexceptionable testimony in favour of this slandered princess, we shall produce four other Protestant historians as witnesses on her side. Collier writes thus:—“It may be affirmed, without panegyric, that the queen's private life was all along strict and unblemished. It must be said that religion had the overbalance: the other world was uppermost with her; and she valued her conscience above her crown.....That she was

not of a vindictive, implacable spirit, may be inferred from her pardoning most of the great men in Northumberland's rebellion." (*Eccl. Hist.* vol. ii. b. 6. p. 406.) Camden says: "A princess never sufficiently to be commended of all men, for her pious and religious demeanour, her commiseration towards the poor, and her magnificence and liberality towards the nobility and churchmen." (*Intr. to the Annals of Q. Eliz.* p. 10.) Echard testifies: "She was a woman of a strict and severe life; who allowed herself few of those diversions belonging to courts: was constant at her devotions, &c..... She much endeavoured to expiate and restore the sacrileges of the last reigns." (*Hist. of Eng.* p. 327.) And Fuller states, that "she hated to equivocate in her own religion; and always was what she was, without dissembling her judgment, or practice, for fear of flattery..... She had been a worthy princess, had as little cruelty been done under, as was done by her." (*Ch. Hist.* b. viii. p. 42.)

We shall close this vindication of the memory of a calumniated and ill-treated virtuous princess, with Dr. Lingard's vivid delineation of Mary's character:—"The foulest blot [he says] on the character of this queen is her long and cruel persecution of the reformers. The sufferings of the victims naturally beget an antipathy to the woman by whose authority they were inflicted. It is, however, but fair to recollect what I have already noticed, that the extirpation of erroneous doctrine was inculcated as a duty by the leaders of every religious party. Mary only practised what *they* taught. It was her misfortune, rather than her fault, that she was not more enlightened than the wisest of her contemporaries.

"With this exception, she has been ranked by the more moderate of the reformed writers among the best, though not the greatest, of our princes. They have borne honourable testimony to her virtues; have allotted to her the praise of piety and clemency, of compassion for the poor, and liberality to the distressed; and have recorded her solicitude to restore to opulence the families that had been unjustly deprived of their possessions by her father and brother, and to provide for

the wants of the parochial clergy who had been reduced to penury by the spoliations of the last government. It is acknowledged that her moral character was beyond reproof. It extorted respect from all, even the most virulent of her enemies. The ladies of her household copied the conduct of their mistress, and the decency of Mary's court was often mentioned with applause by those who lamented the dissoluteness which prevailed in that of her successor.

“The queen was thought by some to have inherited the obstinacy of her father; but there was this difference, that before she formed her decisions, she sought for advice and information, and made it an invariable rule to prefer right to expediency. One of the outlaws, who had obtained his pardon, hoped to ingratiate himself with Mary by devising a plan to render her independent of parliament. He submitted it to the inspection of the Spanish ambassador, by whom it was recommended to her consideration. Sending for Gardiner, she bade him peruse it, and then abjured him, as he should answer at the judgment seat of God, to speak his real sentiments. ‘Madam,’ replied the prelate, ‘it is a pity that so virtuous a lady should be surrounded by such sycophants. The book is naught: it is filled with things too horrible to be thought of.’ She thanked him, and threw the paper into the fire.....

“It had been the custom of her predecessors to devote the summer months to ‘progresses’ through different counties. But these journeys produced considerable injury and inconvenience to the farmers, who were not only compelled to furnish provisions to the purveyors at inadequate prices, but were withdrawn from the labours of the harvest to aid with their horses and wagons in the frequent removals of the court, and of the multitude which accompanied it. Mary, through consideration for the interests and comforts of the husbandmen, denied herself this pleasure; and generally confined her excursions to Croydon, a manor of the church of Canterbury. There it formed her chief amusement to walk out in the company of her maids, without any distinc-

tion of dress, and in this disguise to visit the houses of the neighbouring poor. She inquired into their circumstances, relieved their wants, spoke in their favour to her officers, and often, when the family was numerous, apprenticed, at her own expense, such of the children as appeared of promising dispositions.....

“Though her parliaments were convoked for temporary purposes, they made several salutary enactments, respecting the offence of treason, the office of sheriff, the powers of magistrates, the relief of the poor, and the practice of the courts of law. The merit of these may probably be due to her council ; but of her own solicitude for the equal administration of justice we have a convincing proof. It had long been complained that in suits, to which the crown was a party, the subject, whatever were his right, had no probability of a favourable decision, on account of the superior advantages claimed and enjoyed by the counsel for the sovereign. When Mary appointed Morgan chief justice of the court of common pleas, she took the opportunity to express her disapprobation of this grievance. ‘I charge you, sir,’ said she, ‘to minister the law and justice indifferently, without respect of person ; and notwithstanding the old error among you, which will not admit any witness to speak, or other matter to be heard in favour of the adversary, the crown being a party, it is my pleasure, that whatever can be brought in favour of the subject, may be admitted and heard. You are to sit there, not as advocates for me, but as indifferent judges between me and my people.’.....

“Mary may also claim the merit of having supported the commercial interests of the country against the pretensions of a company of foreign merchants, which had existed for centuries in London, under the different denominations of Easterlings, merchants of the Hanse towns, and merchants of the Steelyard. By their readiness to advance loans of money on sudden emergencies, they had purchased the most valuable privileges from several of our monarchs. They formed a corporation, governed by its own laws : whatever



duties were exacted from others, they paid no more than one per cent. on their merchandize: they were at the same time buyers and sellers, brokers and carriers: they imported jewels and bullion, cloth of gold and silver, tapestry and wrought silk, arms, naval stores, and household furniture; and exported wool and woollen cloths, skins, lead and tin, cheese and beer, and Mediterranean wines. Their privileges and wealth gave them a superiority over all other merchants which excluded competition, and enabled them to raise or depress the prices almost at pleasure. In the last reign the public feeling against them had been manifested by frequent acts of violence, and several petitions had been presented to the council, complaining of the injuries suffered by the English merchants. After a long investigation it was declared that the company had violated, and consequently had forfeited, its charter: but by dint of remonstrances, of presents, and of foreign intercession, it obtained, in the course of a few weeks, a royal licence to resume the traffic under the former regulations. In Mary's first parliament a new blow was aimed at its privileges; and it was enacted in the bill of tonnage and poundage, that the Easterlings should pay the same duties as other foreign merchants. The queen, indeed, was induced to suspend, for awhile, the operation of the statute; but she soon discerned the true interests of her subjects, revoked the privileges of the company, and refused to listen to the arguments adduced, or the intercession made, in its favour. Elizabeth followed the policy of her predecessor: the steelyard was at length shut up; and the Hanse towns, after a long and expensive suit, yielded to necessity, and abandoned the contest."

The modern editors of Fox charge Mary with being "unacquainted with the *constitution* of the country," and that "she sought to *domineer* over the rights of *private judgment* and *trample* on the *privileges of mankind*." The above facts, however, prove most incontestibly that Mary was not only a constitutional queen, but that she was careful of the privileges of her subjects, and anxious that justice should be meted out

to them. Had these editors applied the charge to their darling Bess, they would not have swerved from the truth. This lady has been lauded to the skies as a pattern to all sovereigns, though there never was a more merciless tyrant on the throne of England, not even excepting her father Henry. We have given her character from the pen of the last named historian, in the first volume, and we recommend its perusal here, that the unprejudiced Protestant may see how much he has hitherto been deceived in the conduct of Elizabeth, and be enabled to draw a fair contrast between the qualities of the two sisters. We will say nothing of Elizabeth's birth, but let her be judged by her actions after she came to the crown. In the first place, she committed perjury, by swearing to protect the Catholic religion, and afterwards seeking to destroy it. If she preferred the new doctrines, why not openly avow her sentiments, as her sister did in favour of the old faith, and not call Heaven to witness what she did not intend to perform? She destroyed most of the ancient nobility of the kingdom by the most unjust and iniquitous means, and created a race of titled upstarts, governed by the worst vices. She persecuted and displaced the old clergy, who were men of learning, and thrust into their places the refuse and scum of the ecclesiastical order, as well as idle tradesmen, who thought they should get more by thumping a cushion than mending a kettle. She sold licenses, pardons, dispensations, &c., and put military law into execution on trivial occasions. In a word, authentic history proves that Elizabeth was a sovereign, regardless of the honour of her crown or the lives and property of her subjects; yet, being the founder of the church established by law, she is cried up by those interested in its loaves and fishes, and by others out of hatred to the ancient faith, as a glorious queen, and the honour of her country.

The modern editors, after giving nearly 360 pages of the sufferings of martyrs, as they are dubbed, conclude their tenth book with some remarks on "the severe punishment of God upon the persecutors of his people, and such as have

been blasphemers, &c.," which are not worth criticising. We shall, therefore, dismiss this book with one observation. If national calamities are to be considered a mark of God's judgment on the wicked, the broils and civil wars, the execution of a king, the exile of his son for years, the foundation of debts, taxes, poor-rates, pauperism, and every evil that can impoverish and enslave a people—all which may be traced in the page of history as progressively befalling this country since the period of the Reformation, so called, and are now nearly arrived at a crisis, threatening the most dreadful results—England has most assuredly experienced God's wrath, for abandoning the religion He came on earth to establish with his blood, and which was the creed of the country for more than nine hundred years.

## BOOK XI.

The eleventh book of this work is headed: "A general Account of the Attempts made by the Papists to overturn the Protestant Government of England, from the Accession of Queen Elizabeth to the Reign of George II." It commences with "*The Spanish Armada*," of which we shall only say, that if this was an attempt by *the Papists* to overturn Elizabeth's government, the *Catholics* of England were not parties to it, as it is acknowledged by all authorities worthy of credit, that they took the most conspicuous part, and were principally successful in destroying this Spanish Armada. One fact we think quite sufficient to establish this statement, and that is, that the lord high admiral who commanded the English fleet was a Catholic.

## THE GUNPOWDER PLOT.

The next subject is the "Horrid Conspiracy by the Papists for the destruction of James I., the royal family, and both Houses of Parliament; commonly known by the name of the *Gunpowder Plot*." Had the modern editors termed it a horrid conspiracy on the part of the Protestant statesmen for the destruction of the Catholics of England, they would have come much nearer the truth. The father of James I. was actually blown up with gunpowder, at his house at Kirk-a-field, near Edinburgh, as he lay sick in his bed, by Protestant conspirators; but it was not intended to serve James in like manner. This plot was a *sham one*, to answer political purposes, contrived by Cecil, the secretary of state, and the hypocritical celebration of it, with the mockery of a religious ceremony, was jocosely called by James himself, *Cecil's Holiday*. That there were a few desperate Catholics engaged in it we do not deny; but it should be also known, that to a Catholic lord is attributed the discovery of it. It

is admitted by all men of learning and sound understanding at this day, that the plot was a *forgery*, palmed upon the people to inspire them with hatred against the Catholics, and conceal the designs which the ministry then entertained, and afterwards put into execution, of harassing, robbing, and persecuting the remnant of the Catholic aristocracy who had escaped the fangs of Elizabeth's satellites. The author of *The Political Catechism*, printed in 1658, the Hon. Peter Talbot, an ingenious writer, says, that Cecil was not so secret in his intrigues but that some of his own domestics became acquainted with them, and, in consequence, a friend of one of them, a Catholic, named Buck, was advised, two months before the disclosure of the plot, to be upon his guard, as great mischief was in the forge against the Catholics.

We shall content ourselves, on this subject, with giving the following acute remarks on the *Gunpowder Plot*, by Dr. Milner, which we extract from the seventh of his unanswerable *Letters to a Prebendary*. "I have mentioned," writes the venerable author, "some of the reasons there are for supposing that Cecil, earl of Salisbury, was as deep in this plot as his father, lord Burleigh, is proved to have been in that of Babington.—(*Politician's Catechism*.) Certain it is that these reasons have had equal weight with many intelligent Protestants, as with Catholics. One of them calls it 'a neat device of the secretary.'—(*Osborne's Hist. Memoirs of James I.*) Another says, that he 'engaged some Papists in this desperate plot, in order to divert the king from making any advances towards Popery, to which he seemed inclinable, in the minister's opinion.'—(*The author of the Political Grammar*.) James himself was so sensible of the advantages which his minister reaped from this plot, that he used afterwards to call the 5th of November *Cecil's Holiday*. Finally, a third Protestant writer assures us, 'that this design was first hammered in the forge of Cecil, who intended to have produced it in the time of Elizabeth;.....that, by his secret emissaries, he enticed some hot-headed men, who, ignorant whence the design first came, heartily engaged in



it.'—(*Short View of Eng. Hist. by Bev. Higgons.*)—Thus much seems certain, that the famous letter delivered by an unknown messenger to Lord Monteagle, never was written by a real conspirator, whose life was concerned in the issue of the plot. Such a character would not unnecessarily, and with infinite risk to his cause and his life, have given his friend a written notice not to attend parliament, at a time when he could not know whether parliament would or would not be further prorogued, and whether a hundred accidents might not otherwise prevent Monteagle from being present at it. He would not have given such advice ten days before parliament could possibly meet, when the previous notice of a few hours, or even minutes, would have answered the supposed purpose as effectually in his friend's regard, and ensured his own safety. In a word, he would not have explained the nature of the horrid scheme, in those significant terms which occur in the letter, to a person who is supposed not to have been sufficiently tried to be admitted into the band of conspirators. But if, on the other hand, we suppose the letter to have been written and sent by Cecil in order to draw that young lord into the punishment, if not into the guilt, of the conspiracy, and that, in case he had not made it known, other Catholic peers, in succession, would have received similar letters, a certain space of time was evidently necessary for this purpose, and still more so for devising the means of breaking the matter to James himself, so as to give himself the credit of first discovering the mystery.

“Secondly, The secretary's delaying for the space of five days to communicate a business of that importance to his master, and his purposely deferring to have the cellars under the parliament-house examined previous to the very day of opening the session, prove that he had the management of the plot in his hands, and that he delayed the disclosure of it in order to have time for throwing his net over a greater number of persons, and those of higher quality than were yet engaged in it.\*

\* See a relation of the discovery of the gunpowder, &c., preserved in the Paper Office, and corrected in the handwriting of Cecil, earl of Salisbury.—(ARCHÆOL. vol. xii. p. 204.)

“ Thirdly, The character and history of Francis Tresham, Esq., one of the conspirators, lead us to suspect that he was to the earl of Salisbury in this plot, what Maud and Polley had been to his father, lord Burleigh and Walsingham, in a former plot, almost twenty years before. Tresham was of a restless and and intriguing disposition, and had been concerned in the conspiracy of the earl of Essex. He was well acquainted with Cecil, and is known to have had some communication with him concerning the affairs of the Catholics. At the disclosure of the plot he never attempted to fly, presuming, no doubt, that he was sufficiently protected at court; but, on the contrary, he offered his services to apprehend the conspirators. —(*Baker's Chron.*) Being, however, seized upon and committed to the Tower, he met with a sudden death in the course of a few days, and before any trial or examination had taken place. On this occasion a report was spread abroad that he was carried off by a strangury, which is not a disorder that takes a sudden turn; whereas the physician who attended him pronounced that he died of poison.\* —(*Wood, Athen. Oxon.*)

“ Lastly, The fraudulent art and consummate hypocrisy with which it is now evident that Cecil acted in disclosing this plot, confirms the idea that he had the management of it from the beginning. It is proved, then, from this secretary's own papers, that he had known of a conspiracy amongst the Papists, of some kind or other, three months before the letter was brought to him by Monteagle, Oct. 26. —(*Relation of the Discovery, Archæol.* vol. xii. p. 230.) It is proved by his own confidential letter to the ambassador at the court of Spain, written immediately after the breaking out of the plot, Nov. 9, 1605 (*Winwood's Memorials*, vol. ii. p. 170.), that he was acquainted with the whole diabolical malice of it, viz., that it was intended to blow up the parliament with gunpowder. Accordingly, as soon as he had received the letter, he

“ \* Tresham was upon such terms with Cecil that he had access to him at all hours, not only of the day, but also of the night. —(*POLITICIAN'S CATECHISM*, p. 94.) Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, quoted by Foulis in his ‘*Papish Treasons*,’ expressly says that Tresham wrote of the letter to Monteagle. If so, it cannot be questioned who dictated it.”

communicated it, for his own security, to the lord chamberlain, Suffolk, whose office it was to attend to the security of the parliament-house when the king was to go thither : and these two ministers conversed together about the different apartments adjoining it, and particularly about the great vault under it. —(*Winwood's Memorials.*) They agreed, however (that is to say, the prime minister thought it best), that the search in it should not be made before the session of parliament, which was not to take place for ten days, in order, as he confesses, that 'the plot might run to full ripeness' (*Relation of the Discovery*) ; and to see whether any other 'nobleman would receive a similar advertisement' (*Ibid.*) ; that is, to allow him time to send fresh letters to persons of that rank (whom most of all he wished to entangle), if he found it expedient ; finally, to attack the king on his weak side, by making him pass for the Solomon of Great Britain, and to work up the nation to a great fury against the Papists, by the apparently imminent danger to which all that was illustrious in it would appear to have been exposed. Having in his custody a letter of this importance to the nation and the king's person, he nevertheless declined giving James information of it, by writing or messenger, where he was at Royston, during five whole days, that is to say, during half the time that was to run before the winding up of the catastrophe ; because he wished to deliver it in person, in order to guide both the king and the plot to his intended ends. On the last day of October (*Relation of the Discovery*), the king being then at Whitehall, he presents the letter privately ; no one but himself and the earl of Suffolk being present. We are told that neither of them delivered any opinion of his own concerning its contents, attending to hear 'his majesty's conceit ;' and there is no doubt that Cecil then addressed to him that fulsome and ridiculous compliment, which he afterwards committed in writing as his genuine sentiments concerning him, viz., that 'his majesty was endued with the most admirable gifts of piercing conceit, and a solide judgement, that was ever heard of in any age ; but accompanied also with a kind of divine

power in judging of the nature and consequence of such advertisements.'—(*Ibid*, p. 205.) Such a bait was too well seasoned for James's appetite not to be swallowed by him. Accordingly, at the opening of parliament, a few days afterwards, the king declared himself to have been supernaturally assisted in detecting the plot (*King's Speech*, Nov. 9, *Journal of Lords*), by interpreting the letter in a different manner from any other learned man, however well qualified, would have done.—(*Relation*, &c.) His artful minister, still more to indulge his vanity, and afford him greater matter of subsequent triumph, affected to ridicule the whole business, telling him that 'the letters must be written either by a fool or a madman, because of those words in it, *the danger is past as soon as you have burnt this letter*; for if the danger were so soon past, what need of any warning.'—(*Echard's History of England*—*Baker's Chronicle*.) The king, notwithstanding, persisted in interpreting the letter as every other man, without his majesty's inspiration, would have done, namely, he said there was a mine stored with gunpowder under the parliament-house; and, accordingly, he ordered it to be searched for. Cecil, however, makes him insensibly fall into the measure which he had previously concerted with the lord chamberlain, to defer the examination until the eve of the parliament's meeting. Accordingly, in the evening of that day, the chamberlain surveys the parliament-house and the vault under it, and finds everything just as he expected. He sees the heap of fagots under which the powder was concealed, and he meets with Guy Fawkes, who had been engaged to fire it. The moment, however, was not yet come for disclosing the catastrophe of the drama with suitable effect. Hence it was pretended that this visit into the vaults below was made for the purpose of looking for some furniture belonging to the king (*Archæol.* vol. xii. p. 206), and though the lord chamberlain, as Cecil himself tells us (*Ibid*. p. 207), 'observed the commodity of the place for devilish purposes,' and suspected Fawkes, on hearing he was the servant of Percy, he neither gave any orders then for

examining the former, nor for detaining the latter. (*Ibid.*) At length, near the solemn hour of midnight, Sir Thomas Knevet, a popular justice of peace, is sent with his attendants to secure that wretch, and to uncover the barrels of powder, by which means the news of the discoveries would reach the members of parliament in the morning, just as they were preparing to attend it. Thus Cecil gained his second point, that of rousing the nation to a degree of consternation and horror, proportionable to the supposed nearness of its approach to the brink of destruction, and of making its escape appear the effect of a particular providence, and absolutely miraculous. Accordingly the people were taught to believe, that as nothing less than inspiration had enabled the king rightly to interpret Monteagle's letter; so nothing short of a miracle (*Archæol. vol. xii. p. 196*) had enabled the ministry to find thirty-six barrels of gunpowder lying on the ground, and only covered over with fagots a few hours before they were to have been fired; whereas, we have seen, that they knew of gunpowder being lodged in the very cellar where it was found, at least ten days before, and that they agreed together not to look for it till this very time, that is, till the very day of the parliament's meeting."

#### FIRE OF LONDON AND POPISH PLOT.

We are next treated with an "Account of the Horrid Plot concerted by the Papists for destroying the City of London by Fire, in the year 1666." Of this event we shall say no more than what we have said in our first volume of this *Review*, to which we refer our readers. Next follows the "Life and Death of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey; with an Account of the Popish and Meal Tub Plots." The death of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey is still involved in mystery, but not the odium, which remains to this day fixed upon the Catholics by bigots, though a slight reflection will satisfy any reasonable man that the Catholics were the last persons in the world, so far as regarded their own interest, to commit such a crime. Of the Popish or Oates's Plot, no one but



the most blind and bloated entertain any doubt of the flagitious perjuries that were committed by the villain Oates and his colleagues to swear away the lives of innocent Catholics. We have published a narrative of this plot, to which we refer our readers for a full development of that disgraceful event. The modern editors say, that Oates "made the most solemn appeal to heaven, on his trial for perjury, and the strongest protestations of *the veracity of his testimony*." This may be, for the man who could swear away the lives of innocent persons would not scruple to swear himself honest to save himself from punishment. But observe, reader, he was found guilty on the evidence of SIXTY persons, nine of them Protestants. The Meal-tub Plot is too contemptible to call for a single remark.

It has been well observed that the time of the Stuarts was an age of forgery, plots, perjury, and imposture, practised for the purpose, and but too successfully, of exciting public feeling against the Catholics and their religion. Some of these were of the most preposterous nature, and wholly discreditable, yet were they believed by the poor deluded people, who were now become as mad as March hares, having been bitten with the *poperyphobia*.

#### MODERN PROTESTANT MARTYRS.

To the martyrs of John Fox we have now a list of traitors graced with that title. The first is Stephen College, called the *Protestant Joiner*, who was a furious partisan in Oates's Plot, and was convicted of high treason, for which he was executed. Of this man the modern editors say:—"Thus died Mr. College, whose blood, as he himself desired it might, *sufficiently spoke* the justice of his cause, and who seemed in his speech to have some *prophetic* intimations that his blood would not be the last which must be shed to satisfy *the cravings of tyranny and Papistry*." Now, reader, this man's judge, jury, and witnesses were all *Protestants*, observe, and the continuator of *Baker's Chronicle* says:—"Dugdale, Turberville, and others, swore many dangerous and treason-

able words against him, which such an indiscreet hot man was likely enough to speak, though without any thought of putting them in practice. College was upon a negative; so that he could only defend himself by invalidating the credit of the witnesses. The famous Titus Oates engaged now openly with his brethren, Dugdale and Turberville: and the positive contradictions upon oath that passed between these men at this trial lessened very much the credit of the plot they had before sworn to. Oates attested solemnly, that Dugdale and Turberville had both denied to him that they knew anything against College, with some other things to weaken their testimony; while the others in return protested on their oaths, that everything he testified so confidently was utterly false; so that they fell out in the open court in a very indecent manner. This made good diversion for those who disbelieved the plot; but it was very shocking to considerate people to see what wretches these were whose testimony had taken away so many lives, and thrown the nation into such a dangerous combustion.”

Lord William Russell is next on the list, as deep a traitor and as intolerant a religionist as could be found in those days. When lord Stafford was found guilty, on the perjuries of Oates, and sentenced to be *hanged*, the king commuted his punishment to beheading, in consequence of his rank. This lord William Russell denied the power of the king to alter the sentence, and actually carried up an address from the commons to that effect. A very charitable saint, truly, but a fit associate for the modern editors. Then comes Algernon Sidney, another traitor of the deepest hue; and amongst the rest Alderman Cornish, who was sheriff when lord Stafford was executed, and strove hard to have him hanged like a common person. Monmouth's rebellion is also introduced, and the barbarities of Jefferies, a *Protestant* judge, and Kirk, a *Protestant* colonel, are laid to the charge of the Catholics. This is an act of barefaced injustice, too glaring to require comment, and none but the most prejudiced would make the charge.

## IRISH MASSACRE.

We are also presented with the "Rise and Progress of the Protestant Religion in Ireland; with an ACCOUNT OF THE BARBAROUS MASSACRE OF 1641."—The reader is already in possession of the cruelties, the robberies, the murders, and other horrible crimes which marked the blood-stained progress of the Reformation, as it is called, in Ireland. Of the massacre in 1641, on which so much has been said and written, and on which he may form a correct conclusion, the modern editors say:—"The design of this horrid conspiracy was, that a general insurrection should take place at the same time throughout the kingdom; and that all the Protestants, without exception, should be murdered. The day fixed for this horrible massacre was the 23rd of October, 1641, the feast of Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits, and the chief conspirators in the principal parts of the kingdom made the necessary preparations for the intended conflict." Now, unfortunately for the veracity of the modern editors, the feast of Ignatius Loyola is celebrated by the Catholic church on the 31st July, and therefore the Jesuits may stand excused of intending to honour their founder with a general massacre. They further say:—"The day preceding that appointed for carrying this horrid design into execution was now arrived, when, happily for the metropolis of the kingdom, the conspiracy was discovered by one Owen O'Connally, an Irishman, for which most signal service the *English* parliament voted him 500*l.* and a pension of 200*l.* during life." Fortunately for the cause of truth, we have before us Mr. Carey's admirable work, called *Vindicia Hiberniæ*, in which he gives us the examination of this Owen O'Connally, and a greater Munchausen tale never was told. This able writer proves, on the authority of Temple, that "notwithstanding the pretended generality of the plot, the lord-justices, by public proclamation, on the 29th of October, declared that the insurrection was confined to the mere old Irish of the province of Ulster, and others who adhered to

them." This strong fact proves the inaccuracy of the statement as to the general extent of the conspiracy, and the plot "that all the Protestants, without exception, should be murdered." This writer also observes, "That the original views of the insurgents did not comprehend a general massacre, or even single murders, we have further testimony, clear and decisive, derived even from Temple, as well as Warner and Leland, which independent of all other proof, would be sufficient to settle this question for ever, and utterly overwhelm O'Connally's perjured legend. Moreover, if there had been a plot for a general insurrection, and such a massacre as O'Connally swore to, there would have been evidence produced from some of the conspirators: but notwithstanding the lord-justices had recourse to the execrable aid of the rack, and put Mac Mahon and others to the torture, there is not, in the examinations of the former, a single word to corroborate the sanguinary part of O'Connally's deposition. The examinations of the rest were never published. There is not to be found in Temple, Borlace, Carte, Warner, Leland, Clarendon, nor, as far as I have seen, in Rushworth, the examination of a single person engaged in a conspiracy which was said to have extended throughout the whole kingdom, except those of Mac Mahon and lord Macguire! That of the latter was not taken till March, 1642."

The modern editors follow up their description of a general massacre, which we have shewn to be false, with a detail of particulars, unsupported by authority, purporting to shew that the bloody work was not of one day, but that the Protestants fell victims to the fury of the Irish in all parts of the kingdom, day after day. They, however, take care to suppress the cruel acts of tyranny which drove the unfortunate people to deeds which every heart must deplore, and wish for humanity's sake they were buried in oblivion. To exculpate the Catholics of Ireland from the charges brought against them, we shall here enter into some grievances inflicted on them before they resorted to this act of desperation. At the beginning of Charles's reign, the Irish experienced a degree

of lenity and toleration to which they had been strangers since the era of "evangelical liberty;" but the clamours of the Puritan party compelled this prince to recall his indulgent deputy, Lord Falkland, and entrust the administration of the kingdom to two lord-justices, namely, viscount Ely and the earl of Cork. Of these two Protestant statesmen, Leland, the Irish historian, says:—"They, *without waiting for the king's instructions*, fell at once with great *severity* on the recusants, and *soon extended the most rigorous execution of the penal laws to every part of the kingdom.*" These merciless deputies were succeeded by the earl of Strafford, then lord Wentworth, who took upon himself the charge of government in 1633, and held it until a short period of his death, which happened by decapitation, on the 12th of May, 1641. The transactions of this governor are thus spoken of by Mr. W. Parnell, in his *Historical Apology for the Irish Catholics*. "Another material cause of the rebellion [says Mr. P.], which had no connection with religion, was lord Strafford's resumption of the plan *for confiscating the province of Connaught*. The unfortunate landed proprietors had already *twice purchased* their titles from *the crown*, yet Strafford did not hesitate to outrage every feeling of humanity, and every rule of justice, by subverting them a *third time*. This transaction may not perhaps be the most infamous that ever occurred, but certainly the most infamous act of oppression that was ever perpetrated by a *plea of law*, under the *sanction of juries*. It is uncomfortable to dwell on so abominable an outrage: it is sufficient to observe that it was in part *carried by violence*, by fining the sheriffs, imprisoning jurors, and fining them to the amount of 4000*l.* each, by the terrors of the Star-chamber, and the presence of the lord deputy." Another cause, in which religion was concerned, was the perfidy of the Protestant governors, in cajoling the Irish parliament to grant subsidies to the king, and after obtaining the money, withholding from the people the promised benefits stipulated in return. It must here be observed that the Irish parliament consisted mostly of Catholic



noblemen and gentlemen, and as the refractory disposition of the Protestant parliament of England prevented the king from succeeding in gaining the necessary supplies from the Puritan members, he had recourse to his Irish Catholic subjects, and the readiness with which they complied with his demands will be best related by the insertion of the following letter from the privy counsellors, members of the Irish house of commons, to secretary Windebank, in 1639, taken from lord Strafford's State Letters, vol. ii. fol. 397 :—

“SIR,—The happy resolution this day taken in the commons house of parliament, and the observable circumstances which occurred therein to our view, who have the honour to serve his majesty as his privy council here; and who, as members of the house of commons, were present, and co-operating in that resolution; have rendered to us such inward joy and contentment, in the apprehension of the entire affections and great loyalty of this people, abundantly testified thereby, as we esteem it our duties to hasten the glad advertisement thereof to his sacred majesty.

“After the proposal of such acts of grace and advantage to the subject, as we conceived most fit to lead, in order to the propounding of the subsidies, six subsidies were demanded for his majesty: whereupon divers members of the house spake thereunto; some of the *natives* declaring that, as six were granted the last parliament towards enabling the king to pay the debts contracted for the occasions of his crown, and for the better settlement of the revenues; so, at this time, six or more, are fit to be given; it being apparent that the peace and safety of the kingdom are become so nearly concerned.

“Some also of the natives shewing divers precedents in ancient times, and, among these, some, whereby the king, by a mandate from himself alone, without a parliament, caused monies and goods to be taken in Ireland, from merchants and others, towards defraying the charges of his expeditions against the Scots, for the defence of his kingdom; and those having enlarged themselves in that point, mentioned the abundant piety and clemency of his majesty, in being so indulgent to his subjects as to decline that example of his progenitors, and to require aid of his subjects in a parliamentary way; some of them said that his majesty should have a fee simple of subsidies in their estates on like occasions, for the honour of his person, and safety of his kingdoms: it was fit to be done, though it were leaving themselves nothing besides hose and doublet. Some of them with much earnestness, after forward expressions of readiness towards advancing the business, concluded, that, as his majesty is the best of

kings, so this people should strive to be ranked among the best of subjects.

“Thus, every of them seeming, in a manner, to contend one with another, who should shew most affection and forwardness to comply with his majesty's occasions, and all of them expressing, even with passion, how much they abhor and detest the Scotch covenanters, and how readily every man's hand ought to be laid to his sword, to assist the king in reducing of them by force to the obedience and loyalty of subjects; they desired that themselves and others of this nation might have the honour to be employed in this expedition, and declared, with very great demonstration of cheerful affections, that their *hearts* contained *mines* of *subsidies* for his majesty; that twenty subsidies, if their abilities were equal with their desires, were too little to be given to so sacred a majesty, from whose princely clemency, by the ministration of the lords lieutenant, so many and so gracious favours are continually derived unto them.

“—In the end, considering the present condition of the kingdom, and how unable they are, without too much pressure to them to advance more at this time; they humbly besought that, by the lords lieutenant's interposition to his majesty, four subsidies might be accepted from them at this time; yet with declaration made by them, *with as much demonstration of loyalty as ever nation or people expressed* towards a king, that, if more than these four should be requisite, and the occasions of the war continue, they will be ready to grant more, and to lay down their persons, lives, and estates, at his majesty's feet, to further his royal design for correction of the disordered factions in Scotland, and reducing them to a right understanding of themselves, and for the defence and safety of his majesty's kingdoms and people. And they earnestly desired us, of the council then present, that immediately after the rising of the house, we would represent this from the house to the lord lieutenant; which they did with general acclamations and signs of joy and contentment, even to the throwing up of their hats, and lifting up their hands.

“The question being then put, for the granting of four subsidies, with such a declaration to be made besides the act of subsidies, it was unanimously assented to by the whole house; there being found therein not one negative voice: which we mention for the glory of his majesty, that hath so good and loyal subjects, and for the honour and government of this nation.

“And because no words are able fully to set forth the cheerfulness wherewith this people did, in this particular, manifest their sense of his majesty's occasions, their desire to further his majesty's royal intentions, and their entire affections to the honour of his person; and all with most lively expressions of duty and loyalty towards him;

we of his council could have wished, if it had been possible, that his majesty had been in his own person an eye witness of this day's carriage, which we humbly conceive would have been of far more value in his royal estimation than twenty subsidies."

These demonstrations of sincere loyalty were accompanied with a remonstrance of real grievances, among which *the persecutions* they had suffered on account of *their religion* were not the least; and they solicited the enactment of certain laws, for the security of toleration, property, and justice. The king accepted the grants, and promised that these laws should be assented to; but the Puritan faction, alarmed at the unshaken fidelity of the Catholics to the throne, by the basest and most treacherous arts contrived to render the designs of the monarch abortive, and to foment what they called a Popish rebellion. At the head of this detestable party were the two lord-chief-justices, Borlase and Parsons, who succeeded lord Strafford, and *revived the persecutions* against the Catholics with unrelenting cruelty, disseminating, at the same time, throughout the kingdom, the different petitions presented by their faction to the English parliament, and calling for the *extirpation of the Popish religion*, and the lives and estates of the professors thereof. The intolerant and disgraceful terms of the Scottish covenant, entered into by the Puritans of that country, and afterwards assented to by their brethren in England, we have given in preceding pages; to alarm the Irish people, as to the designs of the covenanters, it is stated in Carte's *Life of the Duke of Ormond*, that "a letter was intercepted coming from Scotland to one Freeman of Antrim, giving an account that a covenanting army was ready to come for Ireland, under the command of general Lesley, to *extirpate* the Roman Catholics of Ulster, and leave the Scots *sole* possessors of that province; and that, to this end, a resolution had been taken in their private meetings and councils, to lay heavy fines upon such as would not appear at their kirks, for the first and second Sunday; and on failure of the third, TO HANG, without mercy, all such as were obstinate, AT THEIR OWN

DOORS. This notion [adds Mr. Carte], as appears from a multitude of depositions taken before Dr. H. Jones, and other commissioners, prevailed universally among the rebels, and was chiefly insisted upon by them, as one of the principal reasonings of their taking arms." Enough has been said to prove that, so far from the Irish people living in a state of peace, previous to their rising, they were smarting under the basest persecutions, and every engine was set to work by their merciless enemies to infuriate their minds, and urge them to deeds of vengeance. Thus instigated and alarmed for the safety of their lives as well as their consciences, some few of the Catholics in the north did take themselves to arms, and committed violences, at all times to be deplored, but not to the extent asserted by the modern editors.

Notwithstanding the unqualified assertion, that the insurrection was general, and that nothing less was intended than cutting the throats of all the English Protestants throughout the whole kingdom, it is a fact, incontestibly proved by unimpeachable testimony, that the rising was at first confined to the province of Ulster, and that few or no English Protestants were destroyed at its commencement, or during its continuance. It is a farther truth, that upon intelligence being received of the commotion, the greater part of the Catholic nobility and gentry proffered their services to quell the insurrection, yet their offer was not only rejected, but they were themselves soon obliged to stand upon their own defence against the cruel villanies of the two Puritan chief-justices, one of whom, Parsons, had declared at a public entertainment, that "*within a twelvemonth, no Catholic should be seen in Ireland.*"

That we may not be accused of dealing in vague assertions in refuting the vile falsehoods advanced by the modern editors, we shall confine ourselves to authenticated documents, which are the best tests in favour of a legitimate cause. In the first place, however, let the reader bear in mind, that for a considerable time previous to the actual rising of the Irish

people, which is stated to have happened on the 23rd of October, 1641, the Puritan leaders in the English parliament, those staunch strugglers for liberty of conscience, had been at variance with the king, principally on account of the lenity shewn to his Catholic subjects, and they had, by the most infamous intrigues, perverted the public mind, inflaming it to a degree of phrensy at the supposed bloody principles of Popery, notwithstanding they were constantly assailing the monarch with remonstrances to induce him to spill the blood of innocent Catholics. During these contentions with the sovereign, the Parliamentarians were fully sensible of the faithful and steady loyalty of the Irish Catholics to Charles, although a Protestant, and therefore they were determined to have their revenge. Instigated by this diabolical spirit, the faction kept up a correspondence with the Puritan justices, Parsons and Borlase, who, accordingly, by their own authority, commanded many things contrary to the express direction of the king, for the double purpose of exasperating the Irish Catholics, and driving them to resistance. "The favourite object, both of the Irish government and English parliament," says Leland, "*was the utter extermination of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland.* Their estates were already marked out, and allotted to the conquerors; so that they and their posterity were consigned to inevitable ruin." And well did these mercenaries play their parts. The Irish parliament having sent deputies over to England to obtain the consent of the king to some bills which had been passed by the two houses for the removal of grievances, his majesty expressly commanded the lord-justices, by letter, "to suffer that parliament to sit until his majesty should think fit to determine the same;" but, in order to prevent these bills from passing into laws, the lord-justices caused that parliament to be adjourned for three months, against the declared wish of its members, and that, too, but a few days before the arrival of the deputies from England with the royal assent; nor would they permit proclamation to be made, although urgently solicited so to do, of the gracious intentions of the



sovereign to remove every subject of complaint. On the contrary, they were determined, by the most cruel measures, to drive the Catholics, who were looked upon already as rebels, into a state of insurrection. Accordingly, we find in Carte's *Collection of Letters*, the following order from these lord-justices and the privy council to the earl of Ormonde, then lieutenant-general of the army, dated at the castle of Dublin, 23rd of February, 1641:—"It is resolved, that it is fit that his lordship do endeavour with his majesty's said forces to wound, *kill, and destroy*, by all the ways and means he may, all the said rebels [meaning the CATHOLICS], and their adherents and relievers, and *burn, spoil, waste, consume, destroy, and demolish, all the places, towns, and houses*, where the said rebels are, *or have been*, relieved and harboured, and all the *corne and hay* there, and KILL and DESTROY ALL THE MEN *there inhabiting*, ABLE TO BEAR ARMS."

On the 3rd of March following, as we find from the same Collection, the said lord-justices issued further orders to the earl of Ormonde, directing him to march with 3000 foot and 500 horse "to such places between the Boyne and the sea as his lordship should think fit; and *burn and destroy the rebels of the pale*, WITHOUT EXCEPTION OF ANY. That those *who should offer to come in* should in no other manner be taken in than as PRISONERS, *taken by the power and strength of his majesty's army*. That, if any of them came to the army, it should be the SOLDIERS *that seized on them, before they had access to his lordship; and that they should be denied access to his person*. That *no difference* should be made between the noblemen that were rebels and other rebels." How these orders were executed may be gathered from Dr. Nalson, a Protestant divine, who, in his *Historical Collection*, assures us, that "the severities of the provost-marshals, and the barbarism of the SOLDIERS to the *Irish*, were such, that he heard a relation of his own, who was a captain in that service, relate that *no manner of compassion or discrimination* was shewed either to *age or sex*, but that

the *little children* were promiscuously sufferers with the guilty; and that, if any who had some grains of compassion reprehended the soldiers for this *unchristian inhumanity*, they would scornfully reply, ‘*Why, nits will be lice!*’ and so would dispatch them.”

Goaded by these and numberless other acts of perfidiousness and barbarity, can any one think it surprising that some of the Irish people were in the end roused to commit reprisals on their inhuman persecutors? Is it not rather a matter of surprise that they bore the nefarious practices of their despotic rulers with such patience and forbearance? Would Protestants have been so quiet under Catholic governors? Did the German Lutherans, or the French Calvinists, display such patient suffering under Charles V. and the Bourbons, as the Irish Catholics under Puritan intolerance? Have we not seen the Protestants repeatedly in arms against Mary, and every artifice used to stir up sedition, while she was sedulously devising, and earnestly desirous, that *all* her subjects should be governed *by law and justice*, and secured in their property and comforts? Had, in fact, the Puritans in Scotland and England a twentieth part of the grievances to complain of against Charles and his ministers, which the Irish Catholics had against them? See what Dr. Warner, who was by no means desirous of favouring the Irish, says of the rebellion:—“The arbitrary power exercised by these lord-justices; their illegal exertion of it by bringing people to *the rack* to draw *confessions* from them; their sending out so many parties from Dublin and the other garrisons to *destroy the rebels*, in which expeditions care was seldom taken to discriminate, and men, women, and children were promiscuously slain; but, above all, the *martial-law*, executed by Sir Charles Coote, and *the burning of the pale for seventeen miles in length and twenty-five in breadth*, by the earl of Ormonde. *These* measures not only exasperated the rebels, and *induced* them to commit the like or greater cruelties, but they terrified the nobility and gentry out of all thoughts of submission, and convinced them that there was

no room to hope for pardon, *nor no means of safety left them but in the sword.*" Thus the Irish people found themselves *compelled* to arm; and yet this rising is called by the modern editors and English historians an unnatural and odious insurrection, while the rebellion of the English and Scotch covenanters, fomented by imaginary discontent and religious delusion, is still looked upon as a meritorious struggle for civil and religious freedom.

We have thus established, on the clearest evidence, the fact, that this Irish massacre, as it is called, was originated by Protestants, whose cruelties and extortions urged the Catholics to deeds of retaliation. It is now time to return to the modern editors. They proceed, in a strain of unblushing impudence, and a total disregard of truth, to detail a variety of instances of imputed murders and acts of barbarity, through which it is impossible to follow them, as they take care to suppress both dates and authorities, to prevent us from probing their veracity. It is true, they occasionally give the name of a place to throw dust in the eyes of *their* readers. We will here give the following for examples:—

"At the town of Lissenskeath they hanged above 100 Scottish Protestants, showing them no more mercy than they did the English...

"Upwards of 1000 men, women, and children, were driven, in different companies, to Portendown Bridge, which was broken in the middle, and there compelled to throw themselves into the water; and such as attempted to reach the shore were knocked on the head.

"In the same part of the country at least 4000 persons were drowned in different places. The inhuman Papists, after stripping them, drove them like beasts to the spot fixed for their destruction; and if any, through fatigue or natural infirmities, were slack in their pace, they pricked them with their swords and pikes; and to strike a farther terror on the multitude, they murdered some by the way. Many of these poor creatures, when thrown into the water, endeavoured to save themselves by swimming to the shore; but their merciless persecutors prevented their endeavours taking effect, by shooting them in the water.

"In *one place* 140 English, after being driven for many miles stark naked, and in the most severe weather, were all murdered on the same spot, some being hanged, others burnt, some shot, and many

of them buried alive ; and so cruel were their tormentors, that they would not suffer them *to pray* before they robbed them of their miserable existence....

“ In Kilkenny all the Protestants, without exception, were put to death ; and some of them in so cruel a manner, as perhaps was never before thought of. They beat an Englishwoman with such savage barbarity, that she had scarce a whole bone left ; after which they threw her into a ditch ; but not satisfied with this, they took her child—a girl about six years of age—and, after ripping up its belly, threw it to its mother, there to languish till it perished. They forced one to go to mass, after which, they ripped open his body, and in that manner left him. They sawed another asunder, cut the throat of his wife, and after having dashed out the brains of their child—an infant—threw it to the swine, who greedily devoured it.

“ After committing these and many other horrid cruelties, they took the heads of seven Protestants, and among them that of a pious minister, all which they fixed at the market cross. They put a gag into the minister’s mouth, then slit his cheeks to his ears, and laying a leaf of a Bible before it, bid him preach, for his mouth was wide enough. They did several other things by way of derision, and expressed the greatest satisfaction at having thus murdered and exposed the unhappy Protestants. It is impossible to conceive the pleasure these monsters took in exercising their cruelty ; and to increase the misery of those who fell into their hands, while they were butchering them they would cry : ‘ Your soul to the devil ! ’ . . .

“ In Munster they put to death several ministers in the most shocking manner. One, in particular, they stripped stark naked, and driving him before them, pricked him with swords and pikes till he fell down and expired.”

These examples we think sufficient to shew the want of truth in the relations of these modern pretenders to the “ knowledge of the genuine principles of Christianity,” which abhors lying as an emanation from the evil spirit ; but, to put the question beyond dispute, we shall cite authorities that will clearly prove the accounts to be totally void of foundation. Were credit to be given to the wholesale massacres of the modern editors, we must believe that the Catholics were the minority of the population, instead of being the vast majority of it. We admit the tales are well calculated to excite the prejudices of the ignorant, but the time is nearly gone by when such unsubstantiated stories

could obtain credence; and by giving a few unimpeachable facts of an opposite tendency we hope to accelerate the dispersion of those clouds of falsehood which have too long shaded the page of English history. It has been sensibly observed, by a very acute writer, that there have been no bounds to the exaggerations of our historians as to the number of Protestants said to have been massacred by the Irish in this rebellion. Sir John Temple says, that 150,000 Protestants were massacred in cold blood in the first two months of it. Sir William Petty coolly calculates 30,000 British killed, out of war, in the first year. Lord Clarendon laments, that in the first two or three days of it 40 or 50,000 of them were destroyed. Rapin and Echard both concur in stating the number of Protestants actually murdered at 45 or 50,000, and the continuator of *Baker's Chronicle* reckons them at 200,000. The discrepancy of this testimony is sufficient to shake its credit; for is it to be supposed that men possessing a sincere regard for truth could differ so widely on so important an event? However, we shall proceed with our evidence, and then leave the reader to decide upon the respective merits due to both. The insurrection and massacre are stated to have taken place on the 23rd of October, 1641; now, lord Clarendon says, in his *History of the Affairs of Ireland*, p. 329:—"About the beginning of November, 1641, the English and Scotch forces in Carrickfergus murdered, in one night, ALL the inhabitants of the island Gee (commonly called Mac Gee), to the number of above 3,000 men, women, and children, ALL INNOCENT PERSONS, in a time when none of the Catholics of that country were in arms or rebellion. Note, that this was the FIRST massacre committed in Ireland on either side." The same historian records his testimony of the Irish suffering, without retaliation, in Munster:—"In Decy's county, the neighbouring English garrisons of the county of Cork, after burning and pillaging all that county, murdered above 300 persons, men, women, and children, before any rebellion began in Munster, and led 100 labourers prisoners



to Caperquine, where, being tried, by couples were cast into the river, and made sport to see them drowned. Observe, that this county is not charged with any murthers to be committed on Protestants.”—(*Ibid.* p. 369.)

To this testimony we shall add the following extract from Carte's *Life of the Duke of Ormond*:—"Sir W. Petty computes the British (including therein both English and Scotch) to be, before the rebellion, in proportion to the Irish (in Ireland) as two to eleven; at which rate, there were about *two hundred and twenty thousand* in the *whole* kingdom. Now it is certain that the *great body* of the *English* was settled in *Munster* and *Leinster*, where *very few* murders were committed; and that in *Ulster*, which was the dismal scene of the massacre, there were above one hundred thousand Scots, who, before the general plantation of it, had settled in great numbers in the counties of Down and Antrim, and new shoals of them had come over upon the plantation of six escheated counties, and they were so very powerful therein, that the Irish, either out of fear of their numbers, or from some other political reason, spared those of that nation (making proclamation, on pain of death, that no Scotchman should be molested in body, goods, or lands, &c.). It cannot, therefore, be presumed, that there were, at most, above twenty thousand English souls of all ages and sexes in Ulster at this time; and of these, as appears by the lord-justices' letter, March 4th, 1641-2, there were *several thousands got safe to Dublin*, &c., besides six thousand women and children, whom captain Mervyn saved in Fermanagh; and others that got safe to Derry, Colerain, Carrickfergus, &c."

This latter evidence is directly at variance with the statements of the modern editors, and by far more entitled to credit. The accounts, then, of the hanging of one hundred Scottish Protestants at Lissenskeath, the drowning of one thousand of both sexes and all ages at Portendown, the destruction of four thousand in different *nameless* places, the putting all the Protestants to death, without exception, at

Kilkenny, and the murder of several ministers in Munster, must now be given to the winds, since Sir W. Petty states that but few, *very few*, murders were committed in the two provinces of Munster and Leinster, and that the Scotch<sup>u</sup> were exempted from death by proclamation! Oh! Truth! how are thy beauties disfigured; thy divine attributes abused! Instead of a *general* massacre of all the Protestants, not one hundredth part of the number stated to have been slain in cold blood met with an untimely fate, and those who did suffer must lay their deaths at the door of the Protestant persecutors, who, by their merciless and inhuman conduct towards the unhappy natives of the country, drove them to a state of madness and desperation, after having borne the persecutions of these monsters in cruelty with unexampled forbearance and patience.

So far from the Irish Catholics conspiring the destruction of the Protestants, the plan was laid by the latter to exterminate all the Catholics of that unhappy country. This statement may appear incredible; it is nevertheless as true as it is horrible. Clarendon, Carte, Warner, Leland, and a host of other writers, concur in proving that the predominant Protestant party in England and Ireland meditated, for a long time, the execrable and diabolical project of an utter destruction of the Catholics, and colonising the country with Protestant settlers. The following testimony will shew the infernal spirit which actuated the Protestant party in those days.

Leland writes:—"The favourite object of the Irish governors, and the English Parliament, was the *utter EXTERMINATION of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland!* Their estates were already marked out and allotted to their conquerors; so that they and their posterity were consigned to inevitable ruin."—(iii. 192.)

Warner says:—"It is evident from their [the lord-justices'] last letter to the lieutenant, that they hoped for an *EXTIRPATION, not of the mere Irish only, but of all the English families that were Roman Catholics.*"—(176.)

Clarendon states:—"The parliament party, who had heaped so many reproaches and calumnies upon the king, for his clemency to the Irish, who had grounded their own authority and strength upon such foundations as were inconsistent with any toleration of the Roman Catholic religion, and even *with any humanity to the Irish nation*, and more especially to those of the old native extraction, *the whole race whereof they had upon the matter sworn to EXTIRPATE*," &c. —(i. 115.)

Carte says:—"If it be more needful to dispose of places out of hand, and that it may stand with his majesty's pleasure to fill some of them with Irish that are Protestants, and *that have not been for the EXTIRPATION of the Papist natives*, it will much satisfy both, and cannot justly be excepted against."—(iii. 226.)

"Mr. Brent landed lately here, and hath brought with him such letters as have somewhat changed the face of this government from what it was when the parliament pamphlets were received as oracles, their commands obeyed as laws, and *EXTIRPATION preached for gospel*."—(*Idem*. 170.)

"Though *extirpation both of nation and religion* be not named, yet I conceive it is contrived almost in every proposition; and the consideration thereof confirms me in a full belief of the malicious practices of the Cootes and Ormsbyes, in the county of Roscommon."—(*Idem*. 311.)

"*The term of EXTIRPATION is worn out here*, and the intention not acknowledged to me by the prime authors therein with whom I have been plain after my blunt way."—(*Idem*. 155.)

"The reason of their [the justices'] advice is founded upon *their darling scheme of an EXTIRPATION of the old English proprietors, and a general plantation of the whole kingdom with a new colony*; for this is the meaning of what they allege, to shew it to be 'unsafe for his majesty, and destructive to the kingdom, to grant the petitioners' request; as being altogether inconsistent with *the means of raising a considerable revenue for his crown, of settling religion and*

*civility in the kingdom ; and of establishing a firm and lasting peace, to the honour of his majesty, the safety of his royal posterity, and the comfort of all his faithful subjects.*"—(*Idem.* i. 391.)

"These difficulties and considerations were of little weight with the lord-justices; who, having got a thin house of commons to their mind, of persons devoted to their interests and measures, resolved to improve the opportunity offered, and to get such acts passed, as might distress the king, *exasperate the bulk of the nation, spread the rebellion, and so promote their darling scheme of EXTINGUISHING the old proprietors, and making a new plantation of the kingdom.*"—(*Idem.* 330.)

"Such considerations as these were not agreeable to the views of the lord-justices, *who had set their hearts on the EXTIRPATION, not only of the mere Irish, but likewise of all the old English families that were Roman Catholics,* and the making of a new plantation all over the kingdom; in which they could not fail to have a principal share; so all their reasonings, upon all occasions, were calculated and intended to promote that their favourite schemes."—(*Idem.* 293.)

"These measures *served their own scheme of an EXTIRPATION,* by racking those gentlemen, whose treatment could not fail of deterring everybody from venturing themselves into their power for the future."—(*Idem.* 301.)

"These propositions certainly came from some of *that party of men which first formed the design of an EXTIRPATION of the Roman Catholics, and, by publishing that design, made the rebellion so general as it proved at last.* They all breathed the same spirit; and *though EXTIRPATION both of nation and religion was not expressly mentioned,* yet it seemed to be contrived effectually in all the propositions. They appeared so monstrous and unreasonable, that it was thought they could proceed from nothing but an high degree of madness or malice."—(*Idem.* 502.)

"There is too much reason to think, that, as the lord-justices really wished the rebellion to spread, and more

gentlemen of estates to be involved in it, that THE FORFEITURES MIGHT BE THE GREATER, *and a general plantation be carried on by a new set of English Protestants, all over the kingdom, TO THE RUIN AND EXPULSION OF ALL THE OLD ENGLISH AND NATIVES THAT WERE ROMAN CATHOLICS*; so, to promote what they wished, they gave out speeches upon occasions, insinuating such a design, and that *in a short time there would not be a Roman Catholic left in the kingdom*. It is no small confirmation of this notion, that the earl of Ormonde, in his letters of January 27th, and February 25th, 1641-2, to Sir W. St. Leger, imputes the general revolt of the nation, then far advanced, to the publishing of such a design; and when a person of his great modesty and temper, the most adverse in his nature to speak his sentiments of what he could not but condemn in others, and who, when obliged to do so, does it always in the gentlest expressions, is drawn to express such an opinion, the case must be notorious. I do not find that the copies of these letters are preserved: but the original of Sir W. St. Leger's, in answer to them, sufficiently shows it to be his lordship's opinion; for, after acknowledging the receipt of these two letters, he useth these words: *The undue promulgation of that severe determination, to EXTIRPATE the Irish and Papacy out of this kingdom, your lordship rightly apprehends to be too unseasonably published.*"—(*Idem*. i. 263.)

We have here produced evidence sufficient to convince every candid mind that the spirit of Protestantism has been the origin of those evils that have afflicted Ireland for these last three hundred years, and made the people of that country the most miserable of human beings. To a system of misrule and proscription, and not to the pretended arts and intrigues of the Catholic priesthood, are the Irish indebted for the sufferings they have endured, and now endure. The sword and cannon, the knife and gibbet, plunder and destruction, were the means used to introduce the Protestant religion into Ireland. Penal laws and proscription have been continued by every ruling faction to maintain its existence in



that country; but neither force nor fraud has succeeded in subduing the invincible constancy of the Irish people to the faith planted by St. Patrick in their green isle. Let us hope, then, that after so long a trial of unshaken constancy, their reward is near at hand, and that they are soon to receive what they have always been ready to grant to others,—equal civil rights and perfect freedom of conscience.

#### REBELLIONS AND CONSPIRACIES OF THE PAPISTS FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE REIGN OF GEORGE II.

Hard is the case of the poor Papists, who, it seems, are doomed by these modern editors not only to father their own sins, but such as may be imputed to them by any bigot, and those, too, that are actually committed by Protestants. These sagacious writers say:—"It is now our task to relate another of those horrible plots which will for ever disgrace the name of *POPERY*, and render it obnoxious to every one who is not blinded by the *specious* statements of its supporters—we mean the *ASSASSINATION PLOT*, formed for the destruction of that truly great and good monarch, William III." Now, is it not a little singular that the greatest part of Christians are so blind that they prefer this obnoxious name to the more modern one of Protestantism? But are Papists the only plotters? Did not Protestants conspire against their king, James II? and is it lawful on the part of Protestants to dethrone their sovereign, and unlawful on the part of Catholics only? William assisted to drive his father-in-law from his throne, and James could not be blamed for seeking to regain it. But the scheme was to *ASSASSINATE* William, and, if we are to believe the modern editors, "it was first projected by the French king, and furthered by the Popish emissaries in England." And they further tell us, that the principal persons in England concerned in the plot for assassinating the king were the following:—"The earl of Aylesbury, lord Montgomery, son to the marquis of Powis, Sir John Fenwick, Sir William Parkins, Sir John Friend, Captain Charnock, Captain Porter, and Mr. Goodman." As we are

desirous of bringing this volume to a close, we must be brief in our notice. Well, then, the majority of these individuals were, we believe, Protestants. Of the plot we have our suspicions that it was not a real one. Of the conspirators tried and executed, three of them, namely, Charnock, King, and Keyes, acknowledged their guilt, but endeavoured to palliate it. (We quote from the continuator of Baker.) Friend denied his knowledge of the assassination, but Parkins admitted something of a design against William, though he was not to act in it. He was *absolved*, at the place of execution, by three nonjuring clergymen, be it remembered, and they were Protestant ministers. Rockwood, Lowick, and Cranburn, were also tried, condemned, and executed. The latter professed himself a Protestant, the other two were Catholics. Sir John Fenwick was tried and acquitted, there being only one witness produced; a bill of attainder, however, was passed against him, and he was beheaded. He was a Protestant, and denied any guilt.

The modern editors, in concluding their account of this plot say:—"Thus was this horrid conspiracy happily frustrated, and the authors of it brought to that condign punishment which their infamy merited. The king's life was the security of his subjects, who heartily rejoiced, as they had reason to do, in being **THEREBY PRESERVED FROM THE MISERIES OF POPERY, AND ARBITRARY GOVERNMENT.**" We shall say nothing in defence of the conspirators, but content ourselves with protesting against the insinuation, that the Catholics, as a body, had anything to do with it. That William's subjects had occasion to rejoice we have our doubts, and as to their posterity, let the present miseries endured by the people of England bear testimony whether the miseries of Popery could be more afflicting than what are now borne by the nation. When James, a Catholic, filled the throne, there was not a shilling of debt contracted; but he was a Papist, as Catholics are opprobriously termed, and therefore *must* be a tyrant. Well, the leaders got rid of him, and introduced William, a Dutchman. He soon began to engage

in wars, which could not be carried on without money; and money could not be safely raised without *borrowing*. The money was accordingly borrowed; a bank was established to manage the money system, and thus was laid the foundation of all the misery, degradation, and poverty, so heavily felt by all classes at this moment, excepting those who live by the system. At the death of William the nation was in debt about £14,000,000 sterling; by this time it has increased to an enormous sum—upwards of EIGHT HUNDRED MILLIONS—while the imposts on the people, in taxes, church and poor rates, &c., amount to sixty millions annually. Blessed effects of excluding the miseries of Popery and arbitrary government! Of the laws that have been passed since the reign of William, it is impossible to give even an outline; suffice it to say, they have been so multiplied, that lawyers are not able to become conversant with the whole code. More have been passed within the last reign to restrict the liberty of the subject, than were ever passed by all the Catholic kings of England, previous to the Reformation, for all purposes; and men are now liable to be sent to confinement for displeasing a watchman of the night. Oh! sweet Liberty! how preferable to the miseries of Popery and arbitrary government! William commenced the debt to preserve the imaginary balance of Europe and Protestant ascendancy; at the end of one hundred and thirty years, England is so crippled by the accumulation of that debt, that she is now unable to man a ship, or raise a regiment, to resent any insult that may be offered; her manufacturers are starving, because they cannot compete with foreign nations in the articles of trade; and many of those who live on the taxes have fled to France, there to spend the sweat and labour of the people of England, because there they have no taxes to pay, and provisions are less than one-half the price they are in this blessed Protestant country. Oh! the charming effects of being “preserved from the miseries of Popery and arbitrary government!”

The next plot mentioned is called ATTERBURY'S, who was a bishop of the church of England, namely, of the see of

Rochester; we may, therefore, hope the sensible reader will exonerate the Catholics generally from being implicated in it.

PERSECUTIONS IN THE SOUTH OF FRANCE, IN  
1814 AND 1820.

Our limits are narrowed, and we must be brief. The modern editors have bestowed eighteen pages on these pretended persecutions, and they have served up some of the most delectable tales ever invented to gull the voracious appetites of the prejudiced. The whole is a mass of improbabilities, contradictions, and falsehoods. Some of the punishments said to have been inflicted on the female part of the Protestants, are grossly indelicate and wholly unworthy of credit. However, there are two or three facts stated that are deserving a slight notice. The Catholics are said to have been furnished with 1000 muskets and 10,000 cartouches by the ENGLISH (Protestants), of Marseilles. The French Catholic soldiers are represented as devils incarnate in cruelty, while the Austrian troops (CATHOLICS, too) overflowed with the milk of human kindness. The king of France issued a decree in favour of the poor Protestants, which was not attended to, and the persecution was put down by *the interference of the British government!* They begin their relation with the arrival of Louis XVIII. at Paris, in 1814, which they say was known at Nismes on the 13th of April, 1814, and was received by the Protestants with every demonstration of joy; but they were met by the Catholics with bigotry and intolerance, and who succeeded in procuring an address to the king, in which they stated, "that there ought to be in France but one God, one King, and one Faith." We do not know how many Gods or kings the Protestants would have, but we think *one* is sufficient to worship, and one to rule a nation; as to the number of faiths, there can be only *one* that is TRUE, and, therefore, the fewer the better; but let no *force* be made to reduce them. That the Catholics were not intolerant at that period we have the testimony of

a Rev. Isaac Cobbin, who published a pamphlet against the Catholics and the pretended persecution, in the month of November, 1815; but he was compelled to acknowledge, that "the CATHOLICS THEMSELVES FIRST OPENED THEIR ARMS TO THIS PROSCRIBED PEOPLE, [the French Protestants] and exclaimed: '*Let us embrace—we are now to participate in the same rights—your calamities, and the abuses of the country, are terminated together—Vive la Liberty!*'" Now this does not look like the spirit of persecution, and is directly opposed to the relation of the modern editors. By the charter of the French, granted on the restoration of Louis XVIII. in 1814, all Frenchmen were made eligible to civil office—the free exercise of religious worship was granted—Protestant Ministers were paid by the Catholic government, and allowed about twenty pounds a year more than the Catholic rectors, and where there were five hundred Protestants, a church was built and kept in repair for them, at the expense of the government; nor were the Protestants there, as Catholics are here, called upon to pay tithes to the clergy of the established church. Here, then, is nothing of the spirit of persecution. Let us now see what the modern editors say on the subject of the interference of the British government.

"To the credit of England, the reports of these cruel persecutions carried on against our Protestant brethren in France, produced such a sensation on the part of Government as determined them to *interfere*; and now the persecutors of the Protestants made this spontaneous act of humanity and religion the pretext for charging the sufferers with a treasonable correspondence with England; but in this state of their proceedings, to their great dismay, a letter appeared, sent some time before to England by the duke of Wellington, stating 'that much information existed on the event of the south.'

"The ministers of the three denominations in London, anxious not to be misled, requested one of their brethren to visit the scenes of persecution, and examine with impartiality the nature and extent of the evils they were desirous to relieve. The Rev. Clement Perrot undertook this difficult task, and fulfilled their wishes with a zeal, prudence, and devotedness, above all praise. His return furnished abundant and incontestible proof of a shameful persecution, materials for an appeal to the British parliament, and a printed report,



which was circulated through the continent, and which first conveyed correct information to the inhabitants of France.

“*Foreign interference was now found eminently useful*; and the declarations of tolerance which it elicited from the French government, as well as the more cautious march of the Catholic persecutors, operated as decisive and involuntary acknowledgments of the importance of that interference which some persons at first censured and despised; but though the stern voice of public opinion in England and elsewhere, produced a reluctant suspension of massacre and pillage, the murderers and plunderers were still left unpunished, and even caressed and rewarded for their crimes; and whilst Protestants in France suffered the most cruel and degrading pains and penalties for alleged trifling crimes, *Catholics*, covered with blood, and guilty of numerous and horrid murders, were acquitted.”

So, then, FOREIGN INTERFERENCE is very useful and beneficial in the case of *Protestants*; but why, then, not let the Catholics make the *same* application in their case, to the house of Bourbon? However, the fact is, the British government did *not* interfere, and though this busy Perrot, and the secretaries to a London society for protecting religious liberty, made application to the duke of Wellington, at Paris, the noble duke contradicted the charge made against the French government, and denied that there was any persecution of the French Protestants. His grace was corroborated by the French Protestant minister, M. Maron, who published a letter which gave the lie to all the reports spread against the Catholics as persecutors. These documents, with others, may be seen in our *Orthodox Journal*, for December, 1815, and January, 1816. We have there shewn that the affair at Nismes, which, by the by, took place in 1815, and not 1814, was a political squabble between the Bonapartists and the Bourbonists; the former being Protestants, and the latter Catholics. The former were assailants when Bonaparte was in power, and a few of the Catholics, of the lowest class, retaliated when the Bourbons were reseated on the throne. We were favoured with an authenticated document, by the late Rev. Peter Gandolphy, taken and attested at Lyons, in December 1815, and we think we cannot do better than lay it before the reader, in order that he may see what

a trivial POLITICAL affair has been magnified into a terrible RELIGIOUS persecution, by these unprincipled and shameless modern editors:—

“ Religion was no otherwise concerned in the disputes of the inhabitants of Nismes, than inasmuch as it served to distinguish the political principles of the Protestants and Catholics; the former having almost universally professed themselves Bonapartists, whilst the latter generally embraced the cause of the Bourbons. In such cases animosity usually runs high, and reaction or revenge is almost always the consequence of the return of the proscribed party to power. On the restoration of the Bourbons in 1814, the Protestants at Nismes openly expressed their dissatisfaction at the event, and designated it to the Catholics, as the signal for a second St. Bartholomew's day. At the return, therefore, of Bonaparte from Elba, they all took a most active and decided part in his cause; and, in the fury of their politics, violently assailed the Catholics, plundering their houses, destroying their property, and ill-treating their persons. With many others, one Tartalion, of Nismes, became a great sufferer, whilst serving in the army of the duke of Angouleme. On the disbanding of that small royal army, this individual, at his return to Nismes, found his property plundered, his house destroyed, his wife and children forced to conceal themselves in the woods, deriving a subsistence from the commonest herbs and berries, and was himself compelled to subsist in the same manner. When the Bourbons returned, however, in the summer of 1815, and the Bonapartists became again proscribed, this man, half naked, and with an unshorn beard that gave him all the appearance of a savage, issued from his retreat, and, armed with a carabine, entered the city of Nismes; and, in open day, posting himself in one of the streets, deliberately and repeatedly discharged his piece at those whom he conceived had been active in the destruction of his property. As others took up arms, blood was soon shed on both sides; the Catholics, however, prevailed, being the most numerous; and they concluded the affair by forcibly shutting up the conventicles of the Protestants. In the mean time General Lagard received orders from the duke of Angouleme to exert himself in protecting the Protestants; and whilst endeavouring to disperse a body of the royalists assembled before the doors of one of the Protestant churches, he was wounded by a pistol shot fired by one of the Catholic party, whom he had struck with his sabre. The duke on this, observing the determined opposition made to the king's mandates, himself marched with cannon and the national guard of Montpelier, and re-opened those Protestant conventicles which had been shut up. Tartalion was also seized, and

committed to prison. The total number of the sufferers on the side of the Bonapartists was thirty-three, in which only one was of respectable condition in life. He was a merchant, had failed, and, without satisfying his creditors, had afterwards realized a considerable fortune. He was shot in his cabriolet, and is supposed to have lost his life more on account of this private affair than any other of a more public nature. Another Bourbonist, of the name of Pointu, took the same revenge at Avignon as Tartalion at Nîmes, and is now in prison, waiting the sentence of the law; but at the latter place only three or four lives were lost. It is acknowledged by the very Protestants, that none but the lowest of the populace were concerned in these affairs of Nîmes and Avignon, and that the Catholic clergy, as well as the civil authorities, exerted themselves in protecting the Protestants, and bringing the royalist offenders to punishment. Such, however, has been the rebellious spirit of the Protestants in that part of France, and so determined their opposition to the Bourbons, that the government has been under the necessity of disarming them, and arms to the number of 26,000 have been collected; whilst it is supposed that as many more remain undiscovered. Their designs were evidently hostile to the reigning family, which they reproach with bigotry and superstition, because more friendly to the established religion than the family of Bonaparte. The Jacobins of France, as well as some Protestants of England, have equally endeavoured to extract something useful to themselves from the disturbances at Nîmes. But in France the plot has completely failed, and the affair is scarcely ever mentioned. All is now quiet at Nîmes, as well as in every other part of France."

Concluding their account, such as it is, of the pretended persecution of French Protestants, and, with it, the work itself, the modern editors say:—"With respect to the conduct of the Protestants, these highly outraged citizens, pushed to extremities by their persecutors, felt, at length, that they had only to choose the manner in which they were to perish. THEY UNANIMOUSLY DETERMINED THAT THEY WOULD DIE FIGHTING FOR THEIR OWN DEFENCE. This firm attitude apprized their butchers that they could no longer murder with impunity. *Everything was immediately changed.*" So, then, these blessed Christian people did not like to die like the primitive martyrs, who endured persecution for conscience sake, according to the precepts of their Divine Master, who suffered without resistance, to set them an example; but they

must die like TRAITORS, if their persecutors acted under the authority of the government, which the modern editors have been labouring to shew. What would be said by Protestants if such an avowal were made by Catholics? But enough has been said, and this one fact is sufficient to prove that the SPIRIT OF PROTESTANTISM is NOT the SPIRIT of the GOSPEL.

<sup>F</sup>  
THE END

## OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

---

"We believe that there are persons still to be found in the world who, in spite of Father Parsons in olden, and Mr. Maitland in modern times, look upon Fox's Book of Martyrs as a veritable history, and not, as the older of these critics justly described it, 'the falsest volume that ever was published in any tongue.' To such persons the new edition of Mr. Andrews' *Critical and Historical Review* of the book in question (London, M. Andrews.) would be a very wholesome medicine, if they could be persuaded to take it. We think the editors would have done well, perhaps, to have omitted the first three books of the review, and begun with the fourth, where Fox's *lying* begins in good earnest. In the earlier portion of his work his gross mis-statements were mostly the fruit of his intense ignorance; it is only after the year 1000 that his history becomes a tissue of *malicious* falsehoods. Mr. Andrews' refutation both of the one and the other is complete."—*Rambler*, January, 1853.

"We have much pleasure in directing public attention to this republication of one of the most valuable Catholic works ever published in the English language. From the day when its able author, the founder (as he is so justly styled in the title page) of the English Catholic press, published this his great refutation of the lying chronicler of the Protestant 'Martyrs,' the authority of the Elizabethan slanderer, even amongst the ultra-professors of the Reformation, was considerably shaken. Mr. Andrews' work, besides refuting the infamous Fox, contains a very considerable amount of information on the persecution of Catholics during the reign of Elizabeth and her immediate successors, and on other highly interesting cotemporary topics. This work is admirably brought out, in numbers, at two-pence each, and will, we trust, command a large circulation."—*Telegraph*, Oct. 23, 1852.

"We return our thanks to Miss Andrews for the cheap reprint of this invaluable work, which is being issued in weekly parts, at two-pence each. Surely there is not a Catholic in the three kingdoms, knowing this fact, but will at once order it, read it carefully, and then lend it to his neighbours, who have been and are, led far away from truth by the instrumentality of the lying fabrications it so ably refutes. We do not know a work better calculated than this, at the present time, to do good; therefore it is the bounden duty of every Catholic to order as many copies as he can and circulate it far and wide."—*Lamp*, Oct. 23, 1852.

"We are glad to see a reprint, in a cheap readable form, of this celebrated work of the late Mr. Andrews, which was now getting scarce. It excited a great deal of attention when it first appeared, and was mainly instrumental in the conversion of many Protestants. It is impossible for a Catholic, who is such by birth and education, to form an adequate idea of the amount of mischief done by that lying chronicle, 'Fox's Book of Martyrs,' the hatred to Catholicity it engenders, or the fanatical tenacity with which it causes its Protestant readers to cling to heresy and its abettors. Every lie is swallowed devoutly as gospel truth; every perversion of historic truth received as an established fact; and Catholic faith, and doctrine, and discipline, is looked upon



## OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

as the incarnation of blasphemous cruelty. This holy wrath, this pious rancour, is nursed to a white heat, until it descends with tenfold fury upon the head of some luckless kitchen-maid or cook. She is discovered to be a Papist. She eschews meat and dripping upon a Friday. She is asked what religion she belongs to; and, after some shuffling, the poor drudge is compelled to say she is a Catholic. The whole house is up in arms against her. She is either snubbed or abused into giving a warning, or, as frequently is the case, she receives her dismissal on the spot, and is ignominiously expelled the house, with every prospect of starvation before her. For if, after a long and weary search, the poor creature finds another situation vacant, her character is inquired after. What character will an infuriated Evangelical mistress give a discarded Papist cook?—the worst that envenomed bigotry will incite her to give. And so the poor creature is driven from pillar to post, helpless, destitute, starving, and well nigh maddened by disappointment and injustice, until, if it were not for that faith for which she is undergoing a martyrdom, she would be tempted either to apostatize or to fling herself off the nearest bridge into the Thames. Reader, this is no fancy sketch. We have often listened with almost tears of sorrow and indignation to the pitiful tales of these poor Catholic servant girls, as they begged the 'price of a night's lodging' to lay down their wearied heads—wearied beyond the thought or the idea of the rich and well-to-do, in the fruitless search after employment. The same inquiry everywhere. 'Are you a Catholic?'—the same rejoinder, 'We employ no Catholics here'—meets the baffled suppliant at every turn. We verily believe that of all classes in our community who suffer most for their faith is that of our poor servant girls, and they of all others the least fitted, by their helplessness, to battle with this cruel struggle for bread. In the most of them, thanks be to God, their virtue is impregnable. They would rather lay their wearied, fainting heads on the cold stones and die, than support life by crime. But with some, alas! their misery is too great for their feeble powers of resistance to endure. They fall. They swell the number of those wretched outcasts of the streets, and soon sink, broken-hearted, into a premature grave. Such are the fruits which are gathered from reading 'Fox's Book of Martyrs;' and it was to dispel this bigoted, hostile feeling that Mr. Andrews wrote his learned and powerful review of this infamous work. We say infamous; because it was concocted to give a colouring of necessity for the cruel penal laws against the Catholics of England, and no work has rivetted that galling chain of persecution more firmly about the necks of English Catholics, than that rank compound of bigotry and lies, 'Fox's Book of Martyrs.'

"The reprint of this useful review is neatly got up and extremely cheap. We hope it will meet with an extensive sale."—*Catholic Standard*, Oct., 30th, 1852.



GTU Library



3 2400 00592 3226

GTU Library  
2400 Ridge Road  
Berkeley, CA 94709  
For renewals call (510) 649-2500  
All items are subject to recall

239.6

452

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY  
BERKELEY CA 94709

